GOVERNMENT

OF

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

ZONING COMMISSION

+ + + + +

PUBLIC HEARING

IN THE MATTER OF

CSX REALTY DEVELOPMENT CORP. and :

FF REALTY, LLC

: Case No. 05-23

Consolidated Planned Unit Development

Thursday, July 13, 2006

Hearing Room 220 South 441 4th Street, N.W. Washington, D.C.

The Public Hearing of Case No. 04-25 by the District of Columbia Zoning Commission convened at 6:30 p.m. in the Office of Zoning Hearing Room at 441 4th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., 20001, Carol J. Mitten, Chairperson, presiding.

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

CAROL J. MITTEN Chairperson ANTHONY J. HOOD Vice-Chairperson GREGORY JEFFRIES Commissioner Commissioner (NPS) JOHN PARSONS MICHAEL G. TURNBULL Commissioner (AOC) OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

SHARON S. SCHELLIN Secretary

OFFICE OF PLANNING STAFF PRESENT:

JOEL LAWSON STEVE COCHRAN JENNIFER STEINGASSER

D.C. OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL PRESENT:

ESTHER BUSHMAN, ESQ. JACOB RITTING, ESQ.

The transcript constitutes the minutes from the Public Hearing held on July 13, 2006.

$\underline{\mathsf{C}}$ $\underline{\mathsf{O}}$ $\underline{\mathsf{N}}$ $\underline{\mathsf{T}}$ $\underline{\mathsf{E}}$ $\underline{\mathsf{N}}$ $\underline{\mathsf{T}}$ $\underline{\mathsf{S}}$

AGENDA ITEM	PAGE
CALL TO ORDER	. 4
PRELIMINARY MATTERS	. 6
APPLICATION OF CSX REALTY DEVELOPMENT CORP. AND	
FF REALTY, LLC: Case No. 05-23, ANC-5C	. 8
PAUL A. TUMMONDS, ESQ	. 8
Pillsburg Winthrop Shaw Pittman, LLP 2300 N Street, N.W.	
Washington, D.C. 20037	
(202)663-8000	
(202)003 0000	
WITNESSES	
ROBERT KEANE	. 12
ROBERT GOOD	. 22
ROB SCHIESEL:	. 24
JAY JOHNSON	. 34
EARTHA ISAAC	. 91
JAMES ENGELHARDT	. 95
QUINTA MARTIN	. 96
MICHAEL CLARK	. 99
A D.TOTIRN	114

1 PROCEEDINGS 2 (6:48 p.m.) CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Good evening, ladies 3 4 and gentlemen. This is a public hearing of the Zoning 5 Commission of the District of Columbia for Thursday, July 13th, 2006. 6 7 My name is Carol Mitten, and joining me this evening are Vice chairman Anthony Hood and 8 Commissioners Michael Turnbull, John Parsons and Greg 9 10 Jeffries. 11 The subject of this evening's hearing is 12 Zoning Commission Case No. 05-23. This is a request 13 by CSX Realty Development Corporation and FF Reality, 14 LLC for approval of a consolidated planned unit 15 development and related map amendment for property located in the Eckington neighborhood of Ward 5, and 16 17 it's known as Lot 815 in Square 3576. 18 Notice of today's hearing was published in 19 the D.C. Register on April 28th, 2006, and copies of 2.0 that hearing announcement are available to you there 21 on the table by the door. 22 This hearing will be conducted in 23 accordance with the provisions of 11 DCMR Section 3022, and the order of procedure will be as follows. 24

We'll take up any preliminary matters. We'll have the

presentation of the Applicant's case, report by the Office of Planning, report by any other government agencies, report by the affected Advisory Neighborhood Commission -- in this case it's 5C -- organizations and persons in support, and organizations and persons in opposition.

The following time constraints will be maintained in this hearing. The Applicant will have 45 minutes. Organizations will have five minutes, and individuals will have three minutes.

The Commission intends to adhere to these time limits as strictly as possible in order to hear the case in a reasonable period of time. The Commission reserves the right to change the time limits for presentations if necessary and no time shall be ceded.

All persons appearing before the Commission are to fill out two witness cards. They look like this. The cards are on the table by the door. Upon coming forward to speak to the Commission, please give both cards to the reporter who is sitting to our right.

Please be advised that this proceeding is being recorded by the court reporter and is also being webcast live. Accordingly, we ask you to refrain to

1 making any disruptive noises in the hearing room. 2 When presenting information the 3 Commission, please turn on and speak into the 4 microphone, first stating your name and address. When 5 you're finished speaking, we ask that you turn the microphone off because they tend to pick up background 6 7 noise. The decision of the Commission in this 8 case must be based exclusively on the public record. 9 10 avoid any appearance to the contrary, 11 Commission requests that persons present not engage 12 the members of the Commission in conversation during 13 a recess or at any other time. 14 Ms. Schellin will be available throughout 15 the hearing to answer any procedural questions that 16 you have. 17 I'd ask you to turn off all beepers and 18 cell phones at this time so as not to disrupt the 19 hearing, and at this time we'll take 20 preliminary matters. 21 Ms. Schellin. 22 MS. SCHELLIN: Just to advise that the 23 Applicant has filed their affidavit of maintenance, and it's in order. 24 25 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you.

1	Mr. Tummonds any preliminaries?
2	MR. TUMMONDS: Yes. Paul Tummonds, for
3	the record, counsel with Pillsbury, Winthrop, Shaw,
4	Pittman.
5	On June 23rd, we submitted the resumes of
6	our proposed expert witnesses. We have three expert
7	witnesses this evening. The first is Bob King,
8	project architect. The second is Bob Good, landscape
9	architect, and our third witness will be Rob Schiesel
10	on behalf of Grove Slade Associates.
11	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Did everybody
12	have a chance to review those?
13	PARTICIPANTS: Yes.
14	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Any objection to
15	accepting them as experts in the proffered fields?
16	(No response.)
17	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. We'll take the
18	two Bobs and a Rob as experts.
19	MR. TUMMONDS: Wonderful.
20	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Anything else?
21	MR. TUMMONDS: That's all.
22	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Then before we
23	begin, I'd ask anyone who's planning on testifying
24	this evening to stand now, raise your right hand, and
25	direct your attention to Ms. Schellin and we'll

1 administer the oath. 2 (The witnesses were duly sworn.) CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: And I think right on 3 4 time your PowerPoint presentation has come up. So 5 whenever you're ready, please begin. Thank you. 6 MR. TUMMONDS: 7 Again, Paul Tummonds, for the record. First, I apologize for I was a little late 8 this evening and also for our technical difficulties, 9 10 but we are here, and we're ready to roll. 11 Before we start with our presentation, I'd 12 like to note a few documents that we submitted into the record earlier this evening in order to have a 13 14 complete record of this case. 15 The first document is a complete set of the plans, elevations, materials. 16 This is all 17 information that you've seen before, but is now in one 18 complete document. So you only have to look to one 19 place. 20 Second, we have provided a hard copy of 21 the PowerPoint presentation that we are going to be 22 presenting this evening. We've also included a memo signed by the 23 24 bicycle specialist of DDOT's Transportation Policy and 25 Planning Administration, which outlines DDOT's

concurrence with the Applicant's proposal for the construction of the connection to the Metropolitan Branch Trail and DDOT's concurrence with the acceptance and maintenance of that connection.

Finally, the last document we have submitted this even is a two-page document that enumerates the Applicant's proposed conditions of approval of this project. In our testimony this evening we'll be referencing certain conditions in this document that address issues raised by the Zoning Commission and the Office of Planning.

A quick overview of this project shows that it includes 625 to 675 residential units with approximately 60 to 65 units reserved for work force affordable housing, approximately 15,000 square feet of neighborhood serving retail, and a significant project and community amenities package.

The materials filed in the record and the testimony that we'll be presenting this evening fully address all of the issues that were raised by the Zoning Commission at the set-down meeting, the Office of Planning in their set-down report and final report in this case, the Department of Transportation report, as well sa issues raised by the ANC and other members of surrounding community organizations.

I'd like to note that the project has received the support of ANC-5C and the Eckington Civic Association. It is my understanding that representatives of both of those organizations will be here this evening to testify in support of this project.

As discussed in detail in the Applicant's prehearing statement, as was the Office of Planning's report, the proposed development and use of this property fully satisfies the PUD evaluation standards enumerated in Section 2403 of the zoning regulations.

Moreover, the proposed project is entirely consistent with two recent planning studies that have been undertaken by the Office of Planning for the area surrounding the project. First, the project is consistent with the goals and policies of the Office of Planning's industrial land use study. The IL study includes this property in the category entitled an area for land use change, as shown on the slide to my right.

The Office of Planning specifically recommends that this property be allowed to include residential and mixed use transit oriented development. That is exactly what we are proposing in this project.

Similarly, the proposed project is also consistent with the Office of Planning's principles for development in the North Noma area, which are outlined in the draft Ninoma study and as shown on this slide for Transition Area C. It's interesting to note that when you look at this slide, which was included in our prehearing submission, our project is included in their slide for future development in the area. Our project with the extension of Q Street to the property are proposed massing our proposed buildings.

In addition, you can see that the Office of Planning is proposing the encouragement of residential townhouses imbedded in the lower levels of this building. That's exactly what we're proposing for this project as well.

We believe that this project is entirely consistent with both of these planning studies and that it is appropriate for the zoning commission to approve this project at this point.

One final issue that was raised by the Zoning Commission at the set-down hearing was the issue of whether or not this rezoning would constitute spot zoning. We believe that we have addressed this issue in detail in the prehearing statement, and that

1 the proposed application does not constitute spot 2 zoning as the project does not result in -- I'll quote 3 wrenching of а small parcel from 4 environment for the benefit of a single owner and 5 without benefit to the public at large or the area affected. 6 7 If necessary, we will gladly address this issue further if the Zoning Commission has 8 9 questions. 10 With that I will now have the project 11 architect, Bob Keane, discuss the surrounding area and 12 the proposed project. MR. KEANE: Is there a loose microphone 13 that I can use? I think that might be easier. 14 15 Thank you. I'm going to use the laser pointer to 16 17 help. Can you hear me? Is that working? Okay. It's a pleasure being before you this 18 19 We're going to discuss the urban design and architectural, I quess, quidelines and parameters that 20 21 quided us through this process, and I think you'll see 22 that I think with a lot of help from or a lot of collaboration actually through Office of Planning, I 23 think we came up with a pretty cohesive design that I 24

think represents good urban design and contextual

architecture.

Do you want to go to the next slide?

As you can see, here's our site, New York Avenue, Eckington Place. Future New York Metro is just south of this image. I can see that this is a classic D.C. neighborhood with the typical row houses to the north and east. We've got McKinley High School looking down over our site which is a relatively elevated site in the city in this area, and the upper portions of these buildings will actually have capital views, but it's an interesting project in the sense that not only is there a residential neighborhood that we're responding to, but there's an industrial nature with the rail yards and such.

So you can see that there's some strong urban buildings like XM Radio, which hugs the streets and forms an interesting building and nice, safe, sidewalks. You've got some older industrial buildings that are similar in this location and up on the corner of our street and Eckington Place.

We have newer buildings that are industrial in nature that are not behaving like good urban buildings like the Flower Mart Building, which has got a parking lot, and the FedEx building which is surrounded by a sea of parking. These are not good

examples of urban planning. They don't make cohesive urban environments.

Our project, on the other hand, is conforming right up to the street edges, and we're cognizant of the urban pattern. So we're bringing Q Street right through our project. We're then subdividing the project into a north-south manner with a small north-south street, thus creating three very or actually four very discernable parcels. The first parcels are four story row houses -- pardon my jiggly hand here -- the first parcel is at the corner of Eckington and Harry Thomas Way, and then what we call Building 2 and Building 3.

The project steps from the lower residential fabric and the industrial midrise industrial fabric up to the taller buildings toward the eastern side of our project.

Just a quick look at the character of the neighborhood. You can see there are some highly repetitive row houses and some more eclectic row houses. This is Quincy Place and this is our street, and actually on our street there are some very contemporary row houses, and like you see in a lot of D.C. neighborhoods, you have some round elements like this that's actually very typical on corners as well.

The industrial character I mentioned is illustrated here. XM Radio is what I call a large skin building. It has got large punched openings. The building at R Street and Eckington is a frame building, very typical of industrial buildings of its The People's Building, which I believe is a former industrial building, is similar in its fenestration and patterns, and then the nonconforming FedEx building is, I guess, sort of a post modern fenestration.

And I think it is interesting that this little piece of fragment of XM Radio has got some very interesting, nice steel details, industrial details that are really, I think, in keeping with the industrial nature of this neighborhood.

A few institutional buildings to mention. Of course, McKinley High School is a very beautiful Georgian building on top of the hill. We've got the new Metro just to the south of our site, New York and Gallaudet, and of course, -- I'm blanking on the name of this -- ATF complex -- thank you very much -- by Moshe Sofdie, which is going to be very interesting when it is all said and done.

And then this is that Capitol view I mentioned. This is actually standing up on the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

McKinley parking lot looking back at the city, and you can see when you're probably at the upper third of our project, which will be right about here, I think you'll have very stunning views of the national Capitol.

Again, the site plan conforming to its streets, to its boundaries. Here's Q Street coming through, making a very important connection to the future. Metropolitan Branch Trail which runs along the west edge of the rail yard, which is right here, which will connect down to the Metro below.

We were very conscious of trying to develop a street that really had a variety of shapes and scales. We have a 60 foot right-of-way that opens up to a 120 foot by 20 foot space, pinches back down to 60 feet and then opens up to 180 by 120 foot space. That features paved plazas and semi-private greens and public plazas, and Bob Good, our landscape architect will get into more of that detail.

We consciously went at programming the ground level of this project to make it very, very urbane and to create an environment that is very, I guess, energized and vibrant. So we started out by placing 15,000 square feet of retail at the corner of Eckington and Harry Thomas Way. I guess this looks

kind of brownish, I guess, today. It's usually orange. All of these orange pieces of the program, if you can make that out, those are all duplex units that actually open onto the street like townhouses.

These four story buildings right here are two-over-two units, meaning they function like townhouses from the street for the first two levels, and then people will enter a lobby right here at this passageway to go up to the two story units above.

But it really activates the streetscape like typical D.C. row houses along the new Q Street. These are four story townhouses that will very much activate the street. We've got the retail, and then all of these duplexes that turn the corner on Harry Thomas Way and even on Q Street, all work and function like townhouses at the street level. So you don't get these long expanses of like you find in large apartment buildings where there's no street activation.

And then the purple, if you can discern that, is the actual lobby. So you enter Building 3 off of Harry Thomas Way. You enter Building 2 and Building 1 off of Q Street, and the service, we deliberately took the parking access and the service off of Q Street to make this as pedestrian friendly an

environment as we possibly could. So we've grouped the service and the garage entrances on this little north-south street, and the service and garage access to Building 3 is up in the northeast corner.

As I mentioned, the base of our buildings really function as townhouses to activate the street. So you can see here's a stoop and a private entrance. That's somebody's two-story unit. This is another two-story unit, and then in the apartment buildings you have flats above.

This is a slide. I apologize. It's a little dark, but you can see the variety of spatial experiences as you come down Q Street. I mentioned a 60 foot right-of-way, two 24-foot drive aisles, an eight foot parking lane, four foot planning strip, six foot sidewalk, and then there was actually an additional couple of feet up against the building because the 60 feet actually goes to the bay windows and then there's actually a couple of feet where there's another planning strip which actually fosters this little space for the stoop.

But you can see there's a semi-private green and then an urban plaza that, again, Bob will get into and some very nicely landscaped entrance plazas and entrance greens into the apartments.

This is an aerial view as if you're in the helicopter above XM Radio looking down on our project, and we deliberately broke the building down so that it is perceived to be not one, two, three large buildings with some townhouses, but it really looks like one, two, three, four, five actual forms along Harry Thomas Way. We deliberately wanted the project to break down in scale and not seem like one large complex with one palate.

We actually brought five palates that are in front of you today. So Building 1 features a brown and a wine colored brick, and then that wine colored brick jumps the road and we've got other palates that march around, and I'll get into that a little bit more later.

This is that north-south street that looks back at the row houses beyond, and you can see there's a one-way passageway that will allow the residents of the townhouses to get back to the parking behind the row houses.

This is a view of our project if you were crossing over the New York Viaduct today, and again, this just illustrates, I think, the variety of the architecture and the patterns. These buildings that were closer to Eckington Place and closer to the

2.0

neighborhood were conceived of as skin buildings with bay windows and corner turrets not unlike the elements that are found in the neighborhood and then as we start to move away, the building really starts to -- these buildings wanted to take on more of an industrial quality. So you can see this building has more of a frame quality and this building is a little bit of a hybrid with an industrial frame and actually a floating metal plane that sort of nods to the industrial nature of the railroad in the shiny silver trains that are passing by.

And then you can see that there's a basement or top treatment to all of these buildings, which is typical of a lot of traditional D.C. buildings. So in our mind these are like abstracted row house compositions with larger buildings looming above them.

And then this is a quick look down Q Street. Again, you can see the row houses are on your left. The carved out entrance port to Building 1 is on your right, and we deliberately pushed a glass element off of Building # to form as a visual marker marking the end of Q Street as it bends toward the pathway.

Detail of the base of the building just

shows a variety of materials and textures and awning ideas and surround ideas utilizing painted steel channels not unlike what we saw on the XM Radio Building.

We took those ideas, those industrial ideas, and we wove those into these buildings to make them be in concert, if you will, with the neighbors, and again, you saw this previously. This is a detail at the base of Building 1. Again, the large industrial sash is not unlike XM. The shell arched windows is not unlike XM Radio, and then we go to Building 2 and the patterns and the textures are a little more contemporary, horizontal detailing to windows, but that's another row house. That's another duplex and off street.

And then this is Building 3, another abstraction of a rowhouse with a brick base and some metal textures sliding behind, and then this is that floating metal plane that I mentioned previously.

And then we have a variety of entrances. This is an entrance into Building 1 with a steel and glass canopy, a different canopy entering Building 2, and then similar steel detailing at the row houses at the window heads and the windows and the door surrounds. This is the very similar steel detailing,

1 although it's painted in an off white manner, which is 2 a little bit more in keeping with traditional row 3 houses that tend to have light stone accents and light 4 window frames. And that's the end of the architectural 5 urban planning discussion, and I'll turn it over to 6 7 Bob Good. MR. GOOD: Again, for the record, my name 8 is 9 Good from Stevenson & Good, Landscape 10 Architects in Alexandria, Virginia. 11 The preponderance of the landscape on this 12 project is along or adjacent to public spaces. 13 it's a very public landscape. It comes in the form of 14 streetscapes, rich streetscapes with street trees that 15 run along the streets, Q Street as it goes through the project, Harry Thomas Way to the south, and Eckington 16 17 Place along the west side, and it changes a great deal 18 similar to Bob's description of the architecture and 19 the way they've broken down the buildings to provide 20 a sense of scale. 21 The landscape does the same thing and 22 follows that lead as it goes through the project. 23 Can you go to the detail? This is Building 1 on the west side of the 24 25 O the north side of Q Street, sidewalks project.

front the townhouse entries. So it goes right along with it, a line of street trees curbside, a sidewalk and then at the base of those buildings, a foundation, a zone of foundation planting to play up that front porch sort of character.

On the south side, there is a great deal more variance in the dimensions of the space as Bob mentioned. Again, sidewalks with street trees, but at the major building entrances, they open up into fairly significant courtyards, arrival courtyards, if you will, with gardens, some special pavements.

We have, in fact, on these - it's hard to see on this, but we've actually necked down the entrances in there to try and facilitate and prioritize pedestrian movement across those, and there's also a series of low walls that reflect the base of the building in character and texture and color material as well.

Building 2, a similar courtyard on the south side. On the north side we had a little bit of opportunity here to open the space up. It opens up into a casual urban square to really a rectangle. That is a shady basque if you will. It's about 110 feet long and about 25, plus or minus, feet deep. It is backed by a larger green space that is, as Bob

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 mentioned, semi-private to the use of the residence of Building 3 primarily, but it does provide a fairly 2 3 substantial feeling of openness along Q Street. 4 Q Street is really a movement from east to 5 west and west to east. So it reflects that. Again, here's some perspectives that the park or the urban 6 7 square where it opens up, there's another line of trees in there, and in the background -- it's hard to 8 9 see on this one. In the background there's a larger 10 green space. 11 Sort of another component is the 12 Each of the major Buildings 1, 2, and 3 roofscapes. have a community use on the Roof, a community pool, 13 14 what you see here, and each one has a component of a 15 green roof, an intensive green roof, Segment 1, 2, to provide interest to the community uses up there, but 16 also it's a function from a storm water management 17 18 standpoint. They huge, but they will aren't 19 contribute. 20 MR. TUMMONDS: Thank you. 21 Our next witness will be Rob Schiesel from 22 Grove Slade. 23 MR. SCHIESEL: Thank you, Paul. 24 I am also delighted to be here. 25 is Rob Schiesel. I'm with Grove Slade Associates.

When we were asked to start examining the site from a transportation perspective, the first thing we did is look at the regional setting of the site as it is in the district, and what we found was that there are several major transportation characteristics in the area.

The first is I-395 and New York Avenue, our two major vehicular routes in the city and in addition, several major arterials in the city highlighted here in the lighter blue color, Florida Avenue, H Street, North Capitol Street, and Rhode Island also pass near to the site.

In addition, the site is well served by transit, most notably the new New York Avenue station and the Red Line, which is south of the site nearby, and a myriad of bus lines to travel through the Eckington neighborhood on Rhode Island, North Capitol and as their major routes.

In addition, there is also the proposed and partial metropolitan branch trail running parallel to the tracks and in this section, the Red Line here. So at first glance, this site is at the confluence of several major transportation corridors in several different modes.

So after looking at this perspective, we

went to DDOT and started scoping out what we would want to study for the site. We talked about a lot of the studies being done at the New York-Florida Avenue intersection. It's one of the major things that comes up whenever you start talking about a site in this area.

We know that there's a New York

Avenue quarter study. There's also discussions of proposed interim improvements and other development studies related in the area, such as, you know, the ATF site and other stuff going on mostly south of the New York-Florida intersection.

So a lot of our discussions with DDOT initially in the project focused on neighborhood traffic, the Eckington neighborhood stuff on a site that wasn't necessarily included in the scope of the current studies.

So what we did is we got information on those studies and decided to read those and look at how our site impacts those studies but focus most of our technical analysis on neighborhood intersections and their connections to the other arterials.

Then we looked at going down narrowing in scope all the way down to the block presentation of how the site looks, and what we noticed is there's a

lot of beneficial transportation features about this site. We like the internal street network of Q Street extended and the provision of multiple entrance into this site, four distinct entrances.

There's also multiple entrances to parking lots and parking garages in the site that helps distribute the traffic. It's not all concentrated in a singular place. The same thing with the service access, the on-street parking and everything else that was printed on the site plan helps to distribute traffic. It's a nice showing of a lot of urban features.

The path to the metropolitan trail and eventually to the Metro rail station is nearby and is logically at the end of the Q Street, and in addition, there's also a dedication to providing spaces for car sharing.

Further on more details on a connection to the Metro rail station as it is actually a connection straight to the Metropolitan Branch Trail. So it doesn't just provide access to the Metro station as much as it will provide access to walking routes and biking routes north-south into the city. It will be funded by the developer, and with this connection, it's approximately going to be a third of a mile walk

from the site to the Metro rail entrance, and the walk will not have any stops. You won't have to wait for a don't walk sign at any of the intersections. It will be pretty much a straight shot once you're on the trail.

We also looked at the parking that the site proposed. There are 830 spaces dedicated to the residents and guests with an eventual count in 625 to 675 dwelling units. This equates to around 1.2 to 1.3 spaces per unit. The zoning requirement here is .25 spaces per unit. So we're looking at requirements in the standards and the comparables of other residential urban transit oriented sites. We find that the parking here is sufficient.

So to summarize the transportation characteristics, we found that there's a lot of flexibility among the different modes and within modes of the site, not just can you use several different modes, but within each mode you have a choice of using several different ways to get to and from the site within each mode.

To summarize, there's five major ways out of all these different flexible ways to get out of the site. The main one is going south from the site, driving to the New York and Florida intersection. You

could also leave the site and head west to North Capitol Street to go north and south.

You could also go north from the site to head towards Rhode Island Avenue. Those are the three major ways that you would enter and leave the site driving.

In addition, you can walk south towards any of the destinations you may want to go to there, and especially the new development occurring, or you can walk or take a bike via the Metropolitan Branch Trail, and you could take transit, most notably the short connection to the new Red Line station.

So our analysis focused, like I said, technically on the neighborhood intersections. A lot of the intersections on Eckington, R Street, Second, Third, Fourth Streets is what we looked at. We also did a lot of direct observations of all the five different ways I talked about getting in and out of the site, taking pictures, looking at it during rush hour conditions, and a lot of these observations were actually based on some of our initial meetings with the community looking at other issues that are in the neighborhood.

And we also looked at the New York Avenue-Florida Avenue analyses going on and reviewed how the

site would interact with the findings or conclusion of what we see going on.

The trip generation and the traffic generation by the site was prepared using normal standards that we use for a lot of our district developments. It's national standards based on a lot of data that we get provided for us from WMATA and observations we have performed at other residential sites in the District.

The results show that we estimated that under 50 percent of the traffic during rush hour used automobiles, and this is based on the standards and data we already have, and some of the newer stuff in observation showed that this actually might be conservative to have 54 percent of the traffic reduced. It may actually be higher in comparable parts of the District.

But based on standards and data that we agreed to use with DDOT in our scoping meetings, we show around 46 percent automobile use.

During the rush hour, it then equates to based on the size of the project, 110, 130 directional trips. That means 110, 130 out in the morning and then in back in the evening, which then is around two vehicles a minute going on on those couple different

ways you could get vehicularly in and out of the site.

And of note, that significant lower trip generation that would be generated by a matter of right development in the same area.

To summarize the study findings starting with I'll go back around the ways to get in and out of the site starting with new York and Florida Avenues. Existing this operates at what we consider unacceptable conditions, failing conditions, and in the future we do not expect to have to change significantly.

There is the interim proposed improvement at the New York Avenue-Florida Avenue intersection which we discussed in our report. We think that this improvement will help circulation flow in the area and may help get traffic out of Eckington Place onto New York and Florida Avenues easier. It includes right turns more than left turns and traffic would generally flow better.

But it doesn't add any capacity. There's no more additional lanes. The numbers of cars that actually could be processed would be very similar. So we don't see this actually in any way helping to make the situation an acceptable situation.

So we then expect that a lot of traffic

generated at the site will not rely on this connection during rush hours and that the amount of traffic, the two vehicles per minute generated would not affect the study findings of any of the studies or proposed improvements going on at this intersection.

Getting to North Capitol Street, the intersections in the neighborhood mostly operate at acceptable conditions, and it mostly is used here not to necessarily reflect a problem in traffic signals or stop signs or traffic volumes. As Bob had noted, there's a lot of industrial uses in the area, and we had noticed on mornings, morning rush hours commercial truck traffic can sometimes cue up leading towards North Capitol Street. We observed there not passing through New York or Florida Avenues or not going up to Rhode Island, but instead this is a preferred route and sometimes truck traffic can back up, and in the future we expect this to be a similar situation, that the traffic will operate acceptably through traffic volume standards, and that the additional traffic generated by the site would not affect us.

Getting to Rhode Island Avenue, our technical analysis in the neighborhood intersection showed that using Second or Third Streets which is a one-way pair that reaches Rhode Island, that both have

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

unsignalized intersections with Rhode Island or using a two-way street at Fourth Street which has a traffic signal light at the intersection of Rhode Island, all would be able to all operate now in acceptable conditions and would operate in the future at acceptable conditions. They could easily handle the traffic generated by the site going to and from Rhode Island Avenue.

Looking at walking and biking and taking transit, currently I would -- we show that they are operating in acceptable conditions. New York Avenue Metro Station is under utilized and could accept the trips generated by the residential development at the site, and in the future we think that the connections in Metropolitan Branch Trail, the completion of the Metropolitan Branch Trail and short and long-term pedestrian improvements being discussed about the Florida and New York Avenue intersections would only make walking and biking and taking transit easier in the area.

So to summarize, the Fairfield development contains many beneficial features which all together help reduce the potential trips in and out of the site. It's a good example of transit oriented development that provides ways to get into the site

2.0

with different modes and then within each of those modes there's a major pedestrian transit related improvement of the connections at the Metropolitan Branch Trail which will directly impact the transportation patterns of the site beneficially, and the local transportation system we found in the neighborhood will not -- the impacts will be limited and the neighborhood intersections will continue to operate at the acceptable conditions they are today.

MR. TUMMONDS: Thank you, Rob.

Our final witness this evening is Jay
Johnson on behalf of Fairfield Residential.

MR. JOHNSON: Good evening, Madam Chair and members of the Zoning Commission. My name is Jay Johnson with FF Realty, LLC, and it is, indeed, a pleasure to be here this evening. We've put a lot of effort, study, design, consideration in at the proposal before you.

Before I explain to you our community amenities package and our public package, I would like to thank the staff, the District agencies, and the various community groups that we've worked with for the last 20 months or so to get to where we are tonight. We think we have a very outstanding project, and we're very pleased to present it to you.

Our community amenities package has involved an extensive engagement and exhaustive dialogue process with the surrounding community, and we are convinced that our hard work is reflected by the support that this project has received from not only the ANC-5C, but the Eckington Civic Association.

In regard to a community dialogue process, I'd like to point out that we made the following presentations. We had four separate presentations to the ANC-5C. We had two presentations to the Eckington Civic Association. We had a presentation to the Bates Area Civic Association. We also met and presented to the Edgewood Civil Association. We had a presentation at the Ward 5 economic summit that I believe was conducted last fall, and then we also had numerous meetings with members of the local community schools individual organizations and and the Commissioners on the ANC.

As detailed in the filing which you have before you dated June 23rd 2006, our community amenities package includes the previously mentioned Metropolitan Branch Trail connection. This is consistent with the memo that you've already received from the DDOT bicycle specialist dated July 11th, 2006.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

We'll bill the connection to the DDOT standards and then the city will maintain it, and that's a significant contribution to make the hard connection from our Q Street extended through the site to the planned extension of the trail.

We also are committed to a financial contribution to ANC-5C to create а business improvement district for the North Capitol Street area south of R Street and north of Florida. We also have made a commitment for financial commitments, contributions -- pardon me -- to Emor Elementary McKinley High School and School, а financial contribution is committed to the Eckington Civic Association for historic signage, а financial contribution to the Harry Thomas Recreation Center for a new score board has been promised, and finally a financial contribution to the city year Young Heros Program.

At the request of the Office of Planning, we've also proposed a condition that's in your documents of how we, the Zoning Commission and the Office of Planning will help monitor the ability of how the contributions are being implemented by the various recipients so that you have assurance that they're being committed to and spent in the way we

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

presented to you this evening.

In terms of project amenities, we have 59,148 square feet of work force housing by our current mix, which represents approximately 60 to 65 units, which we feel is a substantial contribution toward that effort.

Of particular we think it is a fantastic amenity for the community. It's a community meeting space of 1,200 square feet approximately at a prominent location along Harry Thomas Way. It's actually at the terminus of the retail anchor and before the townhouses start. It's a street front on Harry Thomas, and we think that will be a great project amenity for community space.

We also will include ZipCar and FlexCar parking spaces in the project, and then regarding the retail, we did extensive meetings with the residents and have looked at local neighborhood oriented retail, and they will include things like a full service restaurant that serves alcohol, a coffee shop, a dry cleaner, and a restaurant or a small grocery store. So not destination retail. It's local, intended for the residents and the neighbors.

We also have developed a construction and development management plan with the ANC-5C, and then

some flexibility on our signing and our awning details for the retail front that you see in your package, and that's in the condition that helps guide what's allowable in terms of signage and how those awning treatments finally wind up.

Finally, I'd like to respectfully request a phasing element for this PUD. We're ready and eager to commence construction of this project just as soon as possible. However, it is a large development. It's over four acres of property, represents a significant capital investment in not only the real estate, but the design, development, the financing, and then the actual construction of over 700,000 feet of space as you can see form our plan.

And so we believe it will be necessary to have some additional flexibility with regard to the completion of all the components of the project. Therefore, we're requesting that within the two-year period of the effective date of the Zoning Commission order and application shall be filed for a building permit for the construction of the extended Q Street, which runs through the site from west to east, and one of the four residential buildings as specified in 11 DCMR Section 2409.1.

The filing of that building permit

1 application would vest the Zoning Commission order, 2 and then an application for the final building permit 3 completing the entire development of the approved PUD 4 project will be filed within seven years of the 5 issuance of the final certificate of occupancy of the first building. 6 7 So with that I'd like to say thank you 8 again and I appreciate your support. 9 Thank you. 10 MR. TUMMONDS: That concludes our 11 presentation this evening. In summation to this part 12 of our presentation, I'd just like to note that the 13 Office of Planning is fully supportive of 14 project, and in the DDOT memo it was finalized on July 15 12th, and it's my understanding was received at some point today by the Zoning Commission. 16 17 I would note that DDOT also has 18 objections to this project provided that the Applicant continues to work with them with regards to future 19 20 development initiatives that we know are going to 21 occur in the area and that will most likely have 22 traffic impacts when looked at in their totality. 23 With that we're ready to answer 24 questions that you may have. 25 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you.

1 Ouestions from the Commission for the 2 Applicant? Questions? Mr. Jeffries. 3 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Thank you for 4 coming out this evening. 5 I have a couple of observations and then a couple of questions. 6 First of all, I think the architect here 7 is quite appropriate and well informed. I think that 8 particularly the larger buildings, I think it really 9 10 is in keeping with some of the character in and around 11 that location. 12 I think the row houses that are at the 13 north end of Q Street are probably a little less 14 animated, and I don't know quite how that can work, 15 but I think you are much more successful with the larger buildings, just very attractive, particularly 16 17 the material sort with use and how you of 18 differentiated some of the massing. And I'm also very happy with Q Street from 19 20 obviously a site planning perspective and, you know, 21 just urban design. I think that was very good in 22 terms of keeping with the street grid. 23 I do have a question about the parking 24 because I note here you're looking at 830 spaces, and 25 you're looking at about 625 to 675 units, and you're

looking at about 15,000 square feet of retail.

So my question is, and this is the thorny issue that we just continue to see here, is that a transit oriented development that perhaps looks over parked. You're looking at over 200 spaces here for guests and so forth. So I'd just like for someone to speak on that.

MR. JOHNSON: Sure. Jay Johnson with Fairfield.

There's really two components that we look at when it comes to parking issues, and actually in this case there's a third and that was a neighborhood concern about overflow parking spilling into side streets and conflicting with premiums space that's already perceived in the neighborhood.

So one way to address that is to, you know, we functionally have one space per unit in the entire development. That's the second tier. It is transient designed and development at a Metro. The hard reality is if people can have a vehicle, they like to have one for weekend use, off-hour use, that kind of thing.

We do have a retail component that we need to be able to accommodate on premise, and then the other is the actual mechanics of constructing the

1 facilities. We would not be in a position to build, 2 and Bob can speak to this a little bit. 3 Each building has, I think, two or three, 4 three plates of parking, and so structurally to curb in a quarter or half pallet just to neck down the 5 parking, the structure is there and the parking is 6 7 facilitated by the necessity of the construction. 8 we feel it's appropriate, and we don't feel we've got 9 too much. 10 Excuse me. There was one other potential. 11 If we find we don't have the full demand for the 12 parking with the uses, there has been entertained some notion that we might do some off-site parking with one 13 14 of the neighboring commercial uses. 15 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: But you're not prepared to proffer that at this point? 16 17 MR. JOHNSON: No, sir. COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: And the retain is 18 19 neighborhood serving. So you're not expecting -- I 20 mean, are you expecting a number of people to drive in 21 the neighborhood to this? Okay. 22 It's probably, again, this parking thing, 23 and we've discussed it here. It's just something that 24 we just continue to see over and over again, and I 25 clearly understand this notion about residential, the

1 neighbors being concerned about parking, on street 2 parking being taken up and so forth. 3 But, you know, it obviously creates more 4 vehicles, and there's always concern about just how 5 many people are going to be, you know, leaving their cars parked during the week and just using them on the 6 7 weekend, and so I just really wanted to state that, 8 and perhaps one of my colleagues here will bring up 9 more of that. The other question that I had is I don't 10 11 think I saw -- what are you proffering as it relates 12 to affordable housing? What income levels, what household income levels? Is that up to 80 percent? 13 14 MR. TUMMONDS: Yes. 15 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Okay. 16 MR. TUMMONDS: I'm sorry. Yes, and that 17 was in our original April 3rd submission. 18 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Okay. I somehow 19 missed that. MR. TUMMONDS: That would be Exhibit C to 20 21 the April 3rd submission. 22 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Okay, okay. It's 23 some other place. I missed it. 24 And then if you could walk me through the 25 truck deliveries for Fed. Express. I think I read

1 somewhere that the neighbors were concerned that there was, you know, truck deliveries, and I think, Mr. 2 Schiesel, you brought that up, at R and North Capitol. 3 4 Can you just drive? I just want to see 5 what the route that these trucks are taking that's causing the congestion. I think you said at R Street 6 7 and North Capitol. And how does that impact on this site? 8 9 MR. SCHIESEL: Okay. FedEx, as we know, 10 is sought of the site. 11 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Right. 12 MR. SCHIESEL: A lot of the vehicles even 13 though they're right next to New York-Florida, many of 14 them come up Connecticut and R Street is right here 15 and then access through the traffic signal here at North Capitol, and in the morning there's a tendency 16 for a queue of several commercial vehicles to back up 17 18 there because of the access to the site. 19 Actually the discussion of commercial 20 truck traffic was actually studied by DDOT in a 21 neighborhood traffic calming study, which included some recommendations and dealt with the issue kind of 22 23 in a more neighborhood standpoint and not as far as a 24 traffic analysis for development standpoint, and they

few recommendations looking

а

had

25

DDOT

at

the

1 classification of roadways and looking at roadways 2 which may be more appropriate. They're classified as 3 collectors or minor arterials by the District. 4 One of the issues is trying to maybe not 5 necessarily limit truck traffic, but distribute it in maybe a more better way. The interim improvement to 6 7 the New York-Florida Avenue intersection, like I said, probably will allow cars -- the way it will help cars 8 9 access Eckington to Florida, Florida from Eckington, 10 will probably reduce the difficulty that those trucks 11 have getting onto the Florida Avenue. the 12 addition, οf And in one 13 recommendations for the neighborhood traffic study was 14 to look at using Rhode Island Avenue more, like we 15 showed that it had a Fourth and Fifth Streets connection to Rhode Island Avenue, have sufficient 16 17 capacity for that type of traffic. 18 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: So the trucks are 19 leaving Fed. Express. They go onto Eckington place, 20 and they make? 21 MR. SCHIESEL: They make --22 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: A right, or they 23 make a left right onto Eckington Place and then onto Florida? 24 25 They come up here into MR. SCHIESEL:

North Capitol, and then they can go north or south there. They are very close here though to this Eckington Place directly right onto Florida Avenue here.

The difficulty right now of that connection has to do with spill-back between multiple intersections and the close proximity between signals, which is one of the things that the DDOT proposed improvement would help clean up. It would convert all of the turns at Eckington to right turn only.

Hence, if you wanted to make a movement, you'd be going around there. It's kind of like a circle. It's not an actual circle, but the movements then would replicate a circle, and then you would make a right turn and then from that right turn you'd be able to get everywhere.

The elimination of the left turn then makes it easier and reduces the spill-back.

COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Also, can anyone comment? And this question is not really just addressing your development, but I'm just concerned about how pedestrian friendly this area is beyond Harry Thomas Way and Q Street. I mean, I think once you walk out and go south, and I think, I mean, obviously everybody has to sort of look at that in

terms of just how pedestrian friendly.

I mean that sort of goes back to this whole parking issue because my suspicion is where this is located, people will probably still be a little more dependent at least for a time being on their vehicles because, you know, at this point until there's some fairly serious, you know, improvements of the infrastructure, I don't see how pedestrian friendly this area is beyond, again, the confines of what you have here.

And, again, that's not your issue, but I'm wondering how that starts to impact, you know, your development and how often people are actually sign those cars.

MR. TUMMONDS: I think that is absolutely an issue, but I think one of the major amenities of this project is that pedestrian connection to the Metropolitan Branch Trail. That's what allows you to get south of the Florida-New York Avenue intersection without having to hopscotch across or, as some refer to, you know, play the Frogger video game to take your life in your own hands to get across that intersection.

So I think that's why one of the most important aspects of this project for not only our

1	residents, but also for the residents of the Eckington
2	neighborhood is providing that pedestrian connection
3	to the Metropolitan Branch Trail and then using the
4	Metropolitan Branch Trail to have a bicycle-pedestrian
5	connection to get south of the site.
6	COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: What's the exact
7	distance? If I'm in one of the row houses, how many
8	blocks? I go through the trail and come down. Was it
9	three blocks, four blocks?
10	MR. TUMMONDS: According to the Office of
11	Planning report, it is approximately .23 miles from
12	the New York Avenue
13	COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Point, two, three
14	miles?
15	MR. TUMMONDS: So just under a quarter of
16	a mile to the New York Avenue Metro Station.
17	COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Okay. Thank you.
18	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Anyone else? Mr.
19	Hood.
20	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes, thank you,
21	Madam Chair.
22	Mr. Seashell (phonetic), did I pronounce
23	your name right?
24	MR. SCHIESEL: Schiesel.
25	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Schiesel. I'm

sorry.

A question for you. I've looked so hard that I've probably overlooked it because I have been looking to try to see what the level of service was on Eckington Place and Florida Avenue. I have looked, and I'm sure it's in your submittal.

MR. SCHIESEL: The intersection of Florida

Avenue and Eckington Place was not included in our

original scoping meetings with DDOT. We have observed

the intersection, but it was not included as a

technical analysis for level of service.

VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Why was that omitted?

MR. SCHIESEL: It was omitted because it has been included in level service calculations in other reports, and DDOT instead wanted us to focus on, you know, a traffic impact study as a traditional matter of intersections, when we originally built this study, we said, you know, if we have so many intersections, let's focus on Second, Third, Fourth Streets, R Street, and looking at the neighborhood because we already know that traffic data and all of its calculations were being performed through the entire set of intersections.

And like I said, to do a level of service

at Florida and Eckington, if we only included that intersection would probably not give us a technically sound result. We would probably have had to scope out an additional ten intersections or traffic signals throughout the whole area, which would then limit our ability to focus on neighborhood issues, which is really what we thought we should be looking at here since there were already several studies underway.

DDOT, in their studies of the interim improvement, have performed those calculations already, but we know that they haven't performed calculations on intersections that we did include.

VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I would think that we would want to provide this for the record because tomorrow I'm going to be thinking about everything you just said when I'm sitting there waiting for that to get changed so I can get through there because I am going to be in that area tomorrow.

So I think that that Eckington and Florida Avenue should be looked at, and I understand all of the sophisticated, technical views, but I really think that that needs to be a part of this particular record, and I'm going to be looking for that, Mr. Tummonds.

The other thing is is Harry Thomas Way now

1	a public street?
2	MR. TUMMONDS: Yes, it was.
3	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Do you know
4	when that was done?
5	MR. TUMMONDS: I want to say it was mid to
6	late '90s. We have a copy of the
7	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Because it was
8	named for him and he was still living, and I think in
9	the District you couldn't name a street for somebody
10	who was still living at that time. That's why it was
11	not a public street. So now it's a public street.
12	MR. TUMMONDS: It's a public street. It's
13	a 90 foot right-of-way.
14	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. The other
15	thing, Mr. Tummonds, and I'm just curious because I
16	see this happening and I'm not being defensive because
17	I live in Ward 5. So let me put that out there, but
18	we know that we cannot give any ANC any money, and
19	when I look in here at a package, and I don't want 5C
20	to be under the impression advising the Applicant will
21	contribute \$30,000 to the Advisory Neighborhood
22	Commission.
23	There needs to be some structure where
24	that money is going. I may be incorrect, Madam Chair,
25	but I know ANCs cannot accept money.

1	MR. TUMMONDS: I know that in the past the
2	Zoning Commission has approved financial contributions
3	to an ANC. For example, the PUD application that was
4	at Wisconsin and Calvert, the St. Luke's Methodist
5	Church, there was a contribution to ANC-3B for
6	projects in that area.
7	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: But not directly
8	to that ANC.
9	MR. TUMMONDS: It was to the ANC, yes.
10	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: It was directly to
11	the ANC?
12	MR. TUMMONDS: To ANC-3B, yes.
13	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Here's what
14	I don't want to happen, is that it says we couldn't
15	give that money to that ANC and it has to go to the
16	Housing Production Trust Fund.
17	MR. TUMMONDS: Do you know what? What we
18	had proposed, and we would be absolutely willing to,
19	with your acquiescence, do this, we had initially
20	discussed, you know, there is a North Capitol Main
21	Streets Program, and we had proposed maybe this money
22	should, in discussions with the community, with the
23	ANC, maybe this money should go to that organization.
24	There was some concerns about that from
25	some members of the community. If the Zoning

1 Commission has concerns about that money going 2 directly to the ANC-5C, we will gladly give that money 3 directly to the North Capitol Main Street Program. 4 VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Let me cut you 5 off. It's not the concern that I don't want to be the one that did not give them that money. 6 7 MR. TUMMONDS: Okay. 8 VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: If you can give 9 the ANC that money, that's great, but I really have 10 not seen that happen exactly like that. I may be 11 incorrect, but like I said, I don't want to see that 12 money have to go somewhere else because we knew we 13 couldn't do it to begin with. 14 MR. TUMMONDS: Okay. 15 VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I don't know. Ι 16 may be wrong. 17 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Well, my recollection, and it's not a strong one, but I think 18 19 we labored over making the contribution to that ANC, 20 and one of the things that's problematic about it and 21 it's problematic in this case is there's no tangible 22 result, and in this case it's seed money for a 23 possible bit or, in the case of the SMD -- I don't remember what that --24 25 VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: SMD, single member

1 district. 2 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Yeah. There was a 3 separate contribution to --4 VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Five C-05, 5000. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Yes, and that didn't 5 have a tangible result either. Community improvement 6 7 projects that had not yet been identified, and I 8 think, you know, we have a very strong bias against 9 the sort of abstract contributions, and so perhaps you could work with them further to provide us either 10 11 evidence that instead of having this sort of general 12 contribution, that at the point when the certificate 13 of occupancy was issued we could see something had 14 happened, not just that a check had been written. 15 That's our preference in terms of accepting these things as amenities. 16 17 So if it's possible to get to a concrete 18 result --19 VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Exactly. 20 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: -- I think that would 21 be all right. 22 VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: And so they would 23 get the money because I've seen in the past that 24 applicants have had to come back and we've had to 25 reroute it, and it goes totally somewhere different.

1 But anyway, explain to me how the 2 community meeting room is going to work. 3 Keane or someone? Mr. Johnson. 4 MR. JOHNSON: Yes. The community mini 5 room is open to be reserved by the ANC, the Eckington Civic, other community groups. It will be controlled 6 7 by the management company that will either responsible for the rental community, if it's rental, 8 or the condo if it's a condo owner's association. 9 10 We will furnish that with filing cabinets, 11 tables, chairs, a reasonable amount of seating, and 12 it's on a scheduled basis. It's not the one space for 13 one organization. It's open. 14 We saw that there's a distinct need as we 15 migrated from space to space to space for the ANC meetings, a church one time, a rec center another 16 17 They needed a home, and this is time. 18 opportunity for different organizations to have a 19 place where they can count on being able to come back 20 to. 21 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Before you leave that 22 subject, is it at no charge or will there be a fee? 23 MR. JOHNSON: No charge. 24 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. 25 MR. JOHNSON: And one of the concerns we

1	heard, too, from the community also was, as Mr.
2	Johnson mentioned, the need to have a filing cabinet
3	there. A lot of the organizations, their materials,
4	their records, if you will, sometimes are maybe in
5	someone's basement. That was really a big push to say
6	that the community meeting space was also community
7	office space as well in order that these
8	organizations have some consistency.
9	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I didn't mean to cut
10	you off, Mr. Hood.
11	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: That's fine.
12	And help me with the extension of Q
13	Street. We're going to make Q Street a public street.
14	That's the goal, right?
15	MR. TUMMONDS: That's correct.
16	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. So all of
17	the streets within the project site, I mean all of the
18	townhomes, will be abutting public streets. So the
19	District will be picking up trash and everything in
20	that area.
21	MR. TUMMONDS: That's correct.
22	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. I think I
23	saw you have a fitness center also. Is it a fitness
24	center?
25	MR. JOHNSON: Each of the Buildings 1, 2

1	and 3 have a club room and fitness center, yes, sir.
2	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: And that's
3	basically just for the residents who live there.
4	MR. JOHNSON: That's correct.
5	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: You're not going
6	to have people from the neighborhood coming in.
7	MR. JOHNSON: No, sir.
8	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. I have an
9	architectural question, and I'm hoping Mr. Turnbull or
10	Mr. Parsons may ask it. So thank you, Madam Chair.
11	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you, Mr. Hood.
12	Mr. Turnbull.
13	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Thank you, Madam
14	Chairman.
15	I just wanted to carry on a little bit
16	with Mr. Schiesel on the traffic study that
17	Commissioner Hood had brought up. We can get into
18	this with the Office of Planning.
19	The Office of Planning also had concerns
20	about those two intersections that you had mentioned
21	before, but DDOT's letter does ask that the traffic
22	consultant go back and that you've agreed to
23	investigate the following, some of those issues that
24	we've talked about.
25	MR. SCHIESEL: Yeah.

1 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay, but that 2 didn't come up in your conversation that you were 3 going to, and it sounded like he was -- I mean, it is 4 a requirement by DDOT that you are going to go back 5 and study it. 6 MR. SCHIESEL: Yeah. 7 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: And I just wanted 8 to make that point. 9 In particular, you know, MR. SCHIESEL: 10 like I said, we looked at their improvements and 11 thought about what our site -- how it would impact 12 DDOT's results. So when we talked with DDOT, it was 13 just last week. We talked about the status of some of 14 these things, and they said, "Well, you know, we've 15 analyzed it, " but they are requesting a few things to help them understand the cumulative effects. 16 17 Like I said, two cars a minute passing 18 through the intersection, if they all pass through the 19 intersection it's not going to change DDOT's results, 20 but they would like to keep stuff on file so that they 21 could start to build, you know, multiple developments 22 as they come through. 23 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okav. 24 MR. SCHIESEL: So that they don't lose a 25 lot of the work that we have done.

1	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: There's one item
2	in page 2 of DDOT's letter that says if an additional
3	analysis demonstrates that a single installation is
4	warranted at 3rd and Rhode Island. DDOT expects the
5	developer to participate in the cost and design of
6	construction, and overall DDOT expects the
7	transportation consultant to conduct further analysis
8	of the instructions, blah, blah, blah.
9	But are you in agreement with that signal?
10	MR. SCHIESEL: We are. We are.
11	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay. Moving
12	along then, getting back to the affordable units, I
13	guess I just want clarification on your drawings. Is
14	it my understanding that the affordable units are only
15	in the highrise buildings? That's what your plan sort
16	of indicates.
17	MR. SCHIESEL: Yes, sir. Yes, sir, that's
18	correct.
19	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: And they're on
20	Floors 3 through 9.
21	MR. JOHNSON: yes, sir.
22	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: And it's hard to
23	tell from the drawing, but they seem to be the smaller
24	units, one bedroom. As I say, it's hard to tell, but
25	it doesn't look like there are any two bedroom units.

1	MR. JOHNSON: I'm not sure that's correct.
2	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I'm not sure.
3	MR. JOHNSON: Do you know what the mix is
4	on the reportables?
5	MR. TUMMONDS: We have stated in our text,
6	and it should be the same in our proposed unit layout
7	that the same ratio of units in the regular building,
8	one bedrooms, two bedrooms, will be reflected in the
9	affordable housing unit mix as well.
10	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay, all right.
11	It's just that on the floor plan the units looked like
12	they were the smaller units, and they didn't reflect
13	some of the bigger units. It was in the recent
14	submittal that you sent that we received tonight, and
15	maybe it's just a little deceptive in the way it's
16	presented, but it's this sheet here. Again, maybe
17	it's hard to tell from the drawing.
18	MR. TUMMONDS: What number?
19	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: It just says third
20	through ninth floors.
21	MR. TUMMONDS: I apologize, Commissioner
22	Turnbull. This was submitted in our June 23rd
23	materials. We did include a proposed affordable unit
24	location plan.
25	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Yes. In your

1 literature here you do have a chart that spells it out, but looking at the floor plan, it sort of shows 2 3 something a little bit different. MR. JOHNSON: Sir, the intent of the floor 4 5 plan was just to give you a graphic representation that they're going to be spread out. 6 7 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay. 8 MR. JOHNSON: Evenly distributed 9 throughout the three buildings and not congregated in 10 some areas that may not be less desirable. 11 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: That's fine. 12 MR. JOHNSON: So we are very keen to the affordable housing, and we integrated to our projects 13 14 all across the country, and we are committed to an 15 equitable distribution of mix and fair our а distribution within the building. 16 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay. 17 Thank you. 18 Thank you very much for clarifying that. 19 I guess one other thing. I was 20 In looking at the site plan and looking at curious. 21 the townhouses, again, it's a very well defined site 22 and you've really tried to integrate a lot into it. 23 I was just concerned about fire truck access trying to 24 get to the back of the townhouses. Can they meet?

Can they get a hook and ladder back there? It looked

1	awfully tight at some of the turns.
2	MR. GOOD: I think the access, on Q Street
3	Extended there's an access on the western part of Q
4	Street that will allow trucks to go in and probably
5	need to back out, which I think is not uncommon in the
6	District.
7	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: There's the duplex
8	units. There's the
9	MR. GOOD: The passage?
10	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Right.
11	MR. GOOD: The passage is 15 feet tall and
12	probably as wide.
13	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay. I guess the
14	other thing I'd like to just try to get a
15	clarification is on, I think, the east elevation of
16	the curbing in the middle building. There's it looks
17	like some kind of solar screen or trellis up, and you
18	didn't go through it, but
19	MR. GOOD: I didn't go into that, but your
20	observations are right. There is an open, I guess,
21	brisolet (phonetic) at the top of that building which
22	will block some of the direct sun entering the
23	glassier portions of that building.
24	So it's both functional and aesthetic. It
25	is an abstraction of a cornice and it's a sunscreen.

1	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay. I guess it
2	looked a little lower than the top. It looked like it
3	was down a floor, but maybe you're right. It shows up
4	on the other elevations of the prospectus a little bit
5	better.
6	How far does that hang over? It's hard to
7	tell exactly what it looks like. You can sort of see
8	that it's projecting out.
9	MR. GOOD: It probably projects three or
LO	four feet, I'm guessing.
L1	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay.
L2	PARTICIPANT: It holds the edge of the
L3	building.
L4	MR. GOOD: Oh, so it's projecting more.
L5	It's more like six feet.
L6	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay. And does
L7	that give enough solar protection to I don't know.
L8	How many units?
L9	MR. GOOD: I think sun angle certainly in
20	the warmer months are relatively high. So I would
21	imagine it may well give protection to the top two
22	floors.
23	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay. And my last
24	sort of comment or observation is I think I forget
25	your name, the landscape architect.

1 MR. GOOD: Bob Good. 2 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Yes, Bob Good. You made a comment that the green roof 3 4 area was not huge. It's kind of meager actually. 5 It's only just on the amenity package for the units. I'm wondering if any thought could be given to 6 7 increase that green roof area. MR. JOHNSON: Well, I think that's going 8 9 to be at the end of the day a design issue. How much 10 space has to be actually occupied for rooftop 11 activities? We didn't want to overstate it. 12 certainly make every effort we can to make it as big 13 as we can because it does enhance the amenity feature, 14 and that's one of our objectives for those areas 15 because it does have a pool. Those are nice spaces. So the bigger we can make it we will. 16 17 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I think we're just 18 looking at it from an overall picture, that the 19 greener the roofs are, the lesser the heat. 20 we're trying to get our buildings to be as green as we 21 can, and we'd like to encourage that in whatever way 22 we can to extend it just beyond just the amenity area. 23 MR. JOHNSON: Understood. 24 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Thank you. 25 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I have a couple of

1 questions. One is about the retail, and realistically 2 speaking I'm not aware of any retail that's up there 3 now, and what retail -- I mean, I understand what the 4 desires are. Realistically what do you expect to be 5 able to attract in terms of retailers? Well, I know in our group 6 MR. JOHNSON: 7 sessions with the community they had specific brand name retailers that they thought would be interested 8 9 in that area. Once we know we've got something we can 10 aggressively petition and market, we'll do that and 11 we'll flesh that out. 12 I don't have a solid answer for you today, but we have made -- Paul, will you help me with some 13 14 of the remembrances? 15 I think what is MR. TUMMONDS: Sure. important, too, is that it's our understanding and the 16 17 understanding of the community as well that the ATF 18 Building does not have a place to eat, a cafeteria, 19 the goal that workers were to go out 20 community to find places to eat. 21 Right now that doesn't really exist. 22 we believe that there will be a market for lunchtime users. So some of the things, retailers we heard from 23 24 were an Au Bon Pan, and High Noon type restaurant.

It was interesting, too that when we noted

it in our statement about a sit-down restaurant with alcohol service and the idea that there is really no place right now for residents of the neighborhood, as well as the 650-plus residents of this project to go to have a sit-down dinner with a glass of wine.

So we think that there is a market for those type of activities because of (a) the commercial users in the neighborhood and then the critical mass of residents that not only this project will bring, but also that exist now in the neighborhood, and truthfully right now they don't have anyplace to go.

So we think that the types of uses are the bagel shop in the morning to get coffee and a bagel, a place to get a sandwich, and hopefully a play gym, dry cleaners, but then also a place to sit down and have dinner.

We think there is a market for that, first of all, just because of the dearth of retail opportunities, restaurant opportunities that exist there now.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I understand the dearth, believe me. I guess I'm just concerned that this is not a realistic expectation to think, first of all, that they could attract a sit-down restaurant to that location because I question whether or not the

ATF people, if they're going to hike, they're going to go down to Union Station. They're not going to come up this way. That would be my thought.

So I just want to have, I guess, a better sense that this is a realistic amenity, that this space will get filled in a reasonable period of time and that it just won't sit vacant.

I would add that when the MR. JOHNSON: size and the configuration of the space were discussed earlier on in our design schematic process, we did do some research on what ceiling heights would be opportunistic for retail and the depths of the retail spaces and this basic size and layout not only with our architect, but in house we have taken it out and idea of functionally gotten а the space is appropriate.

Now, as to the end answer, I would just propose that every good market needs a catalyst. I would remember when we started our project at 1441 Rhode Island Avenue right behind the Fresh Foods, the Whole Foods that just went in, if you walked that site before we stepped in and built our 157-unit project, you would seriously question where those retail and opportunities were going to come.

But they are there. So we firmly believe

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

that the critical mass of the rooftops and the tenants and the owners is going to set the stage for a good opportunity for retail, and we'll find that out very, very quickly.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. I just wanted to weigh in on what Commissioner Jeffries was talking with you about over parking the site, and one of these days we're going to get the nerve to tell people they can't have as much parking as they want, but today is probably not the day.

But one thing that I would like to see is that I think it's a very serious environmental issue to even be attracting people to owning cars, and so I'd like to see in a site that I have concerns about over parking that there be greater emphasis on more environmentally friendly elements.

And we've seen a lot of applicants coming in with more green building elements than you've proposed. So in order to make me feel somewhat better about the fact that I think you're over parking the site, I'd like you to give consideration to some more environmentally friendly elements to sort of offset that, if you would.

I don't know if this is going to answer Commissioner Hood's question fully, but I think two

things that we need to get in the record as you excerpted the north of -- what is it? -- north of Noma If we could get the complete draft in the record so that we can understand the full context, and then if we could get the New York Avenue corridor study, which I understand you made a reference to the website, but if we could actually get that in the record so that we could see what's being suggested, I know if that has the level of service don't information that Commissioner Hood was asking about or if it's at a higher level than that, but I'd like to see both of those because if you'll recall from the set-down, context is very important in this case because we're changing direction for the neighborhood.

And then in the additional work that Mr. Schiesel does in terms of looking at the intersections that DDOT asked you to look at, and so on, I'd like you to in thinking about future traffic volumes not just to think about -- and I think the Office of Planning sort of called this out -- not just to think about what we know, but if we're changing direction for the neighborhood and we're talking about rezoning, talking about as near as I can tell from what's in the record potentially up zoning or at least putting pressure ont he FedEx site and putting pressure on the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 Flower Market site, among others, then that could be 2 something that's quite different than 3 anticipates right now in terms of the traffic that 4 would be generated as a result. 5 So if you'd give some thought to that as you look at these future volumes, and then I think 6 7 we're not going to have another opportunity to have you in front of us proffering things. So I think we 8 9 need to nail down if DDOT expects you to support the 10 installation of a traffic signal or whatever it is, we 11 need to have that quantified, and we need a specific 12 commitment, not an abstract commitment. So whatever we can do to nail that down, 13 14 I think that would be helpful. 15 Oh, one of the things I wanted to ask you about in case I had missed it, you had called out the 16 six design principles for TOD and saying that this 17 18 project incorporates all six, and the one, just to go 19 back to parking for a minute, was creative parking 20 management. So is there something that I missed about 21 22 how the parking will be managed? 23 I think creative parking MR. TUMMONDS: 24 management can be -- it's the inclusion of the flex

space, zip car spaces. So you having spaces on our

property, on our project that get multiple users. I do think we will take a look at the ability to commit that if these parking spaces are not used, we will open that up to the commercial users in the area because what we have heard from members in the community is that XM employees, other employees from those commercial users in that area do park on Harry Thomas Way, Eckington Place.

If I remember correctly, the parking meters on Harry Thomas Way are 12-hour parking meters. You don't see them that often, but it shows you that those are used by the workers in the community or maybe people walking out of the Metro. Those would be perhaps things that we could look at in more depth about creating parking management.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: And then I wanted to ask about something. You know, Mr. Hood and architectural always timid about asking are questions, but have in the Power you presentation and in your submission, you had the details for Building 1 duplex entry, and I know it's not a vast span on the streetscape, but so there's a guy standing there, and so that wall, the white part is like taller than him.

And as I look at it, there would be some

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 distance where someone would be walking past that, and 2 it just strikes me as not particularly friendly to 3 walk by. So I didn't know if you could either explain 4 that to me or -- well, could you explain it to me? 5 MR. GOOD: I can. I would say that's a observation when 6 fair you're looking that 7 particular photograph. This building is nine stories 8 tall. When you look at a lot of classically composed 9 buildings, which there are many of in Washington, 10 the base or the plinth, as part of 11 composition of the tall building, can be relatively 12 large. So I wouldn't say that that base is at a 13 14 human scale, but I would say it's at a scale that is 15 appropriate to the scale of this building. 16 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I thought about what 17 you just said before I made the observation, but to me 18 one of the things that's different, unless it's really 19 like a monumental building when you're walking, you 20 know, along Pennsylvania Avenue or something is that 21 there's windows down there. So that's the thing that 22 was missing from me, is that it's really just a solid 23 That's why it was bothering me. wall. 24 MR. GOOD: It's a fair comment, and you

know, this is a subjective area, and there's nothing

1	cast in stone about where we're setting that line on
2	that particular building, and frankly, it could be cut
3	in half and I don't think it would hurt the design of
4	the building. In other words, we could lower that.
5	I think architecturally it works both
6	ways.
7	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.
8	MR. GOOD: But we're open minded and
9	flexible and collaborative.
10	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Well, it's an
11	observation by a lay person.
12	MR. GOOD: No, it's good.
13	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Mr. Parsons,
14	did you have anything?
15	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Yes, thank you.
16	I, one, want to associate myself with many
17	of the remarks that have been made already. So I
18	won't go over those, but I did have a design question,
19	and it has to do with I guess it's probably called
20	Building No. 2, and it's the steel work at the tenth
21	and eleventh floors, I guess it is.
22	What is its purpose other than decorative?
23	Do the residents then look through this? I'm looking
24	at Sheet No. 10, which is the south elevation. There
25	are a number of elevations that show it.

1 MR. GOOD: I can explain it a little bit 2 further. If you look behind you and imagine these are 3 the windows of that unit, imagine a steel frame that's 4 in the same plane as this ceiling extending out four 5 or five feet and having a perforated metal cap or surface to it. 6 7 So it's really a sunshade, and it is a 8 cornice. So it's doing two things, as I stated earlier. 9 It is an aesthetic element, and it is a 10 functional element. And I think it actually plays 11 into the notion that we are trying to make these 12 buildings have an industrial quality to them. 13 So having exposed, painted steel pieces or 14 elements to the building, I think, is appropriate to 15 its site. COMMISSIONER PARSONS: 16 That's certainly 17 helpful. I certainly didn't understand it had a shade 18 component to it. So how far from the facade of the building 19 does it extend? 2.0 21 MR. GOOD: I think six feet actually. 22 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: So I'm told, but 23 I'm not sure I know that the regulations in this city 24 say 52 inches is the maximum for a cornice. Are you 25 familiar with that?

1	MR. GOOD: Is that with respect to the
2	property line?
3	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: I'm not sure.
4	MR. GOOD: I think it is with respect to
5	the property line. I could be mistaken, but if you
6	look at our building, we've carved away some mass at
7	the top of the building, and it sets back six feet,
8	and that reveals a two story glass wall that's
9	intended to reduce the vertical scale of the building.
10	So what we've done with that cornice is
11	the cornice projects out and actually comes back to
12	the property line. So it is not actually extending
13	over the property lines.
14	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: All right. Would
15	you help me out on the Sheet No. 10? Sheet No. 10,
16	could we look at that?
17	MR. GOOD: Okay.
18	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Have you got Sheet
19	10?
20	MR. GOOD: I think I have.
21	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: So I'm looking at
22	the left edge of that elevation, and I see balconies.
23	MR. GOOD: Right.
24	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: I don't see the
25	setback you're talking about, which is on a different

1	elevation, I guess. So this is protruding out farther
2	than the edge of the balconies; is that correct?
3	MR. GOOD: Okay. I see what you're
4	looking at now.
5	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: So the property
6	line is
7	MR. GOOD: So if you follow, I described
8	the part of the building that set back six feet from
9	the property line, and that happens at the top of the
10	building, and then when you come to the corner of the
11	building, that carveout actually comes down the
12	corner.
13	So if you look at the bottom of that, of
14	the left side of that elevation, you can see that that
15	townhouse base treatment I described earlier comes
16	back out to the plane of the building line, and that
17	cornice above is meeting that plane, that imaginary
18	plane.
19	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: So the cornice
20	extends exactly to the property line.
21	MR. GOOD: Exactly.
22	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Thank you.
23	MR. GOOD: You're welcome.
24	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Anybody have anything
25	else?

1 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Yes. 2 MITTEN: Commissioner CHAIRPERSON Jeffries. 3 4 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Just two more 5 observations, and I'm going to take off of Madam Chair's comment about the retail. You know, I quess 6 7 I try to get a little more comfortable with the retail as it relates to being 15,000 square feet, but I would 8 9 ask the applicant to take a look at some of the other 10 retail that's being planned in and around the area. 11 There is quite a bit of retail that's being planned, 12 in fact, some that's being planned perhaps from the 13 ATF Building. 14 So I would probably tell you, you know, if 15 you can get a little more informed about exactly what the plans are for retail going forward, that would, 16 you know, lend itself back to Madam Chair's concern 17 18 about the viability of the retail. I think the difficult part of this is 19 20 going to be the full service restaurant, getting that 21 there, just but you know, that's 22 observation. And then the other question that I had or 23 observation, Mr. Keane, on the duplex entry Madam 24 25 Chair spoke about, that base, I would hope that you

1 could figure out another way in which to address Madam 2 Chair's concerns without bring that base down because 3 I think it would clearly take away from the warehouse 4 look at I think you've achieved here. I clearly see Madam Chair's concern, particularly looking at the scale of this with the 6 7 sky, but there might be some other ways in which you 8 can, you know, do both things. You cannot take away 9 from the proportions of this industrial building 10 design and still have a more friendlier pedestrian 11 journey as you walk down Q Street here. 12 MR. GOOD: I think one way to do it is to 13 probably not have such a high contrast materials. If that stone texture were based at the 14 15 bottom of the building, which adds a quality to the street environment, were closer in tone to the brick 16 color, which we actually do in Building 3, it would 17 18 probably be much more palatable and less jarring. 19 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: There should be a 20 little bit of a difference. So anyway, again, thank 21 you. 22 Yeah, you're welcome. MR. GOOD: 23 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Anyone else? Mr. Turnbull. 24 25 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Madam Chair, maybe

1	just a follow-up question since Chairman Parson also
2	raised the issue on the brisolet (phonetic). I wonder
3	if we could maybe get some more information or some
4	details of what that really looks like. I think that
5	might be helpful.
6	Thank you.
7	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: And also, Madam
8	Chair, if Mr. Tummonds can provide that issue about
9	whether or not the street is public or private, Harry
10	Thomas Way.
11	You said you had the document. If you
12	could just provide it.
13	MR. TUMMONDS: Yes, absolutely.
14	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you.
15	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Thank you all
16	very much.
17	I think we're ready for the report of the
18	Office of Planning, and I just want to congratulate
19	you on a very thorough written report so that you can
20	summarize for us.
21	MR. COCHRAN: Thank you, Madam Chair.
22	And I think the Office of Planning knows
23	how to take a hint.
24	For the most part, we would like to stand
25	on the record. There are a couple of concerns that

1 were raised by the DDOT report that you got today that 2 we would like to talk about just a bit. I've managed to take so many notes I've 3 4 lost them. 5 Okay. We think that the Applicant has perhaps cast an overly optimistic interpretation over 6 7 the DDOT report. The DDOT does seem to have some 8 concerns. They do not object to the proposed 9 development. They think that this development can be 10 accommodated. I have talked with three people at DDOT 11 who were involved in the writing of the letter. 12 But when I had suggested to them that, well, perhaps it might be a good idea to leave the 13 14 record open to get these studies in that you, DDOT, 15 have asked for, they thought that would be excellent idea. So that would then entail -- and we 16 are recommending that you keep the record open for 17 several things relating to the DDOT report. 18 19 One is to specify the number of flex cards 20 that would actually be offered. 21 A second is to get the study in on the 22 Third and Rhode Island intersection and the possible 23 traffic signal there, and then really pin down if 24 there is а need for it and if so, what the

contribution the applicant might make to participate

in putting that signal there.

The further analysis for the Eckington and Florida and the North Capitol and R intersections. We recognize that nobody is going to solve the problem of New York and Florida Avenue in the near term. Even the interim solution, the so-called virtual circle around the Wendy's is going to only improve. Yes, actually Dan Tangerlini (phonetic) used to refer to it as the Dave Thomas Circle.

But it will only make a level of service F a little better level of service F, and we already know that, but we would still feel that the back-up that you'd get from coming out of Eckington going south onto Florida Avenue at Eckington Place and maybe any joint into Eckington Place or onto R Street from North Capitol in a different rush hour time, that ought to be looked at and addressed.

And then we think that both DDOT and OP ought to have the ability to comment on whatever the applicant submits responding to the DDOT recommendations.

OP believes that the Commission has raised a number of good concerns tonight, and we certainly hope you'll keep the record open on any number of those, including the concern about the specificity of

1 certain of the contributions that are being given for 2 community benefits. We do think that you should be able to identify what is going to come out of it, and 3 4 then have a way of observing whether it's actually 5 there. We certainly agree that it would be a good 6 7 idea to explore and ideally expand the amount of the 8 green roof that is being offered. There were several other concerns that I 9 10 think you have raised. Undoubtedly you'll determine 11 whether you want to put them in the conditions or not, 12 but they all sounded good. I also am available to answer questions on 13 14 the NOMA study and on the New York Avenue corridor 15 study, both of which I worked on from the OP 16 standpoint. 17 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. Questions for Mr. Cochran? Does anybody 18 19 have questions? Mr. Turnbull. 20 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Thank you, Madam 21 Chair. 22 I was just going back to in the report, 23 and I think maybe Dave addressed it, Mr. Cochran. You 24 had mentioned or the report mentions on page 6, they 25 talked about the buildings, and they talked about

public from private space. I looked at the drawings, and it look like there is a defining wall. There is a separation the courtyard. You were looking at something else? MR. COCHRAN: No. You are correct. W have worked with the Applicant on that. There is defining wall. It is rendered in, I believe, either stone or stucco. COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Right. MR. COCHRAN: We were concerned about the definition of the south side of Q Street. The Applicant has addressed that. COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay. Thanks. The only other thing I think you had you were concerned about and we didn't really get int it here the additional study of the impact of	ì
like there is a defining wall. There is a separation the courtyard. You were looking at something else? MR. COCHRAN: No. You are correct. We have worked with the Applicant on that. There is defining wall. It is rendered in, I believe, either stone or stucco. COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Right. MR. COCHRAN: We were concerned about the definition of the south side of Q Street. The Applicant has addressed that. COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay. Thanks. The only other thing I think you had you were concerned about and we didn't really get into the south side of the south side of the south side of the concerned about and we didn't really get into the south side of the south	ì
the courtyard. You were looking at something else? MR. COCHRAN: No. You are correct. We have worked with the Applicant on that. There is defining wall. It is rendered in, I believe, either stone or stucco. COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Right. MR. COCHRAN: We were concerned about the definition of the south side of Q Street. The Applicant has addressed that. COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay. Thanks. The only other thing I think you had you were concerned about and we didn't really get into the south side of the sout	a a
6 MR. COCHRAN: No. You are correct. W 7 have worked with the Applicant on that. There is 8 defining wall. It is rendered in, I believe, either 9 stone or stucco. 10 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Right. 11 MR. COCHRAN: We were concerned about the 12 definition of the south side of Q Street. The 13 Applicant has addressed that. 14 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay. Thanks. 15 The only other thing I think you had you 16 were concerned about and we didn't really get int	a
have worked with the Applicant on that. There is defining wall. It is rendered in, I believe, either stone or stucco. COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Right. MR. COCHRAN: We were concerned about the definition of the south side of Q Street. The Applicant has addressed that. COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay. Thanks. The only other thing I think you had you were concerned about and we didn't really get interest.	a
defining wall. It is rendered in, I believe, either stone or stucco. COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Right. MR. COCHRAN: We were concerned about the definition of the south side of Q Street. The Applicant has addressed that. COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay. Thanks. The only other thing I think you had you were concerned about and we didn't really get interest.	<u>-</u>
general stone or stucco. COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Right. MR. COCHRAN: We were concerned about the definition of the south side of Q Street. The Applicant has addressed that. COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay. Thanks. The only other thing I think you had you were concerned about and we didn't really get into the concerned about and we didn't reall	
COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Right. MR. COCHRAN: We were concerned about the definition of the south side of Q Street. The Applicant has addressed that. COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay. Thanks. The only other thing I think you had you were concerned about and we didn't really get into the concerned a	ž
MR. COCHRAN: We were concerned about the definition of the south side of Q Street. The Applicant has addressed that. COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay. Thanks. The only other thing I think you had you were concerned about and we didn't really get into	ž
definition of the south side of Q Street. The Applicant has addressed that. COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay. Thanks. The only other thing I think you had you were concerned about and we didn't really get into	ž
Applicant has addressed that. COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay. Thanks. The only other thing I think you had you were concerned about and we didn't really get into	
14 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay. Thanks. The only other thing I think you had you were concerned about and we didn't really get into	ž
The only other thing I think you had you were concerned about and we didn't really get into	
were concerned about and we didn't really get int	
	l
17 it here the additional study of the impact of)
in the field the additional study of the impact of	: -
18 lightning on the central portion of the wester	1
building above the second story, your one comment	
20 I'm not sure what	
21 MR. COCHRAN: Excuse me. What page ar	<u> </u>
you on, sir?	
COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Page 14, about	
24 two-thirds down.	;
25 MR. COCHRAN: Right. OP had still hope	

1 that there might be a little bit more variety to the 2 palate on the north side of Harry Thomas Way. This is 3 something that we had suggested in our set-down report 4 also. 5 We like the design as it is, but there is still a bit of uniformity between -- even symmetry 6 7 between -- the buildings that are flanking 8 proposed private way that goes north-south. We're not sure that that kind of symmetry and monumentality is 9 10 a good idea here, and maybe making them look like 11 different buildings with somewhat different materials 12 would be more appropriate. But that's not a real high concern of OP. 13 14 We think the design is really very good and has come 15 a long way since we saw it a couple of years ago. 16 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay. COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: 17 Excuse me. Where is that elevation? What page? 18 19 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Page 6. 20 MR. COCHRAN: Excuse me. If you look in 21 your packet, it's number six, and you can see where 22 you have the curtail wall flanking the private way. 23 It just seems like on one side or the other there 24 might be a bit more relief from the color of the red 25 I realize you're seeing slightly orange red brick.

1 brick over toward Eckington Place, but then you 2 probably have I would just guess 180 feet or so of red 3 brick with glass there. 4 Now, if you go and make the palate 5 significantly lighter on the building that's on the east side of the private way, then it's possible that 6 7 you'd lose a desirable contrast with the building that Mr. Parsons has talked about during the hearing. 8 9 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I just want to ask 10 you about a statement that's in your report, and this 11 is on page 14 also. This has to do with traffic, and 12 you said that OP remains concerned about considering 13 future development proposals other than the 14 current application that lie within the Capital 15 Commerce Center prior to the completion of a more complete traffic study for the area. 16 17 So that makes me want to ask a couple of 18 One is why are you comfortable with this questions. 19 It's one thing to have a terrific study. proposal. 20 It's another thing to have a study that says you 21 should do X, Y, Z to make traffic better, and we know 22 X, Y, Z will be done. 23 help me understand why you 24 comfortable with this proposal. 25 Okay. We had already been MR. COCHRAN:

in conversations with DDOT before we brought our report. We realized that DDOT was going to say that generally this project seems to be okay, but with a few caveats. We did not want to second guess DDOT on this.

It does seem like this is the kind of development where you are going to have an awful lot of cars parked all week and just used on weekends. The other thing to consider is that this project, much like any other residential project that might go in this area is likely to generate less traffic than a matter-of-right project would in here. It's likely to generate less traffic than an office development.

Our main concern is that this project is not the only one that's going to come before you as far as we know for consideration. There have been a number of traffic studies that individual applicants have commissioned around here. There have been several traffic studies that DDOT has done. There hasn't been one overall, and we think that at some point for your information it's going to be necessary to pull them all together, whether it's with -- I don't think it's necessary with this project, which is primarily residential and which is basically the first to the gate.

But you'll eventually be considering some projects that will have office components, hotel components, et cetera.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. So that leads to my next question, which is when they come to us, as we know, people don't like to not be given their opportunity for set-down. How will we effectively say, "No, it's not your time. We're waiting for more studies to be done by DDOT," and not just studies, but things that will have tangible recommendations and that could conceivably get funded so that whatever it is that's an impediment for those developments can be handled.

I'm just concerned about when those projects come before us.

MR. COCHRAN: OP has been encouraging applicants for projects, both those that you've set down and those that we think will be coming before you for set-down, to essentially band together and pull all of this information and in their own best interest, pool some of their funds so that the sum is greater than the parts because we do think that there's enough information there that there can be a decent presentation of existing and projected future traffic conditions with just a little bit more work to

coordinate all of the information that various applicants' traffic consultants have pulled together, long with what DDOT has.

As far as future DDOT changes to this intersection -- excuse me -- to the New York and Florida intersection, we don't see much happening other than the virtual circle. There's an ongoing workshop at NCPC that DDOT and NCPC have co-sponsored right now on that intersection, and we're looking at years and over a billion away, unless there are some changes made five and ten blocks away that decouple the use of New York Avenue as a regional cut-through.

That could reduce traffic by as much as 25 percent, but until that decision is made and the word is basically out that it's just not worth your while to try to use New York Avenue to get from Prince George's County to Northern Virginia, we won't lose that 25 percent traffic.

But we're hoping for something that's much broader based.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I think your advice to whoever it is that you've been talking to is a really good one, not only to band together to put all of the information together, but one of the things that I happen to have some of the knowledge that I

2.0

1	happen to have amassed in my regular job is that the
2	fund of money that DDOT gets to put against their
3	federal match is dwindling, and so, you know, they
4	have a whole schedule of projects that if they were to
5	be able to get the match, they could get the other 80
6	percent of the money from the feds.
7	So if these property owners would band
8	together to provide the district match, then that
9	would
10	MR. COCHRAN: We may have been a little
11	late with some projects, but we've actually raised the
12	possibility of retaining existing gas stations on the
13	first level of some of the projects and incorporating
14	it in proposed development because some of the loss of
15	those local matches is due to the loss of gas
16	stations.
17	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Right, but if we
18	could get it from private property owners, that would
19	be fine, too.
20	MR. COCHRAN: Oh, sure. If the private
21	property owners want to ramp up their proffer offer
22	and consolidate them all, maybe we could get the
23	underpass for 395 totally reconstructed.
24	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Thank you.
25	Anyone else?

1	COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Quickly, this
2	Commission did set down a case, a project that is very
3	near here.
4	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Yes, we did.
5	COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Okay.
6	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: We did.
7	Mr. Tummonds, did you have any questions
8	for Mr. Cochran?
9	MR. TUMMONDS: No questions.
10	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Thank you, Mr.
11	Cochran, very much.
12	We've talked about the DDOT, and I know
13	there's no one here from DDOT. So I guess I won't ask
14	for them. Is there anyone here representing ANC-5C?
15	(No response.)
16	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay, and I would
17	just note, and perhaps, Mr. Tummonds, we don't have
18	anything in the record from them. So the record will
19	be open for some period of time. So if you could help
20	nudge that out of them, that would be great.
21	MR. TUMMONDS: Yes.
22	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Is there
23	anyone who would like to testify in support of the
24	project? Anyone who would like please come
25	forward.

1 Anyone else who would like to testify in 2 support? Don't be shy. You can come forward. 3 Turn in your cards on the way up. 4 Are you Ms. Isaac? MS. ISAAC: Yes, Madam Chair. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Ms. Isaac will 6 have five minutes. 7 8 MS. ISAAC: Okay. 9 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Please go ahead. 10 Chairman Mitten and MS. ISAAC: Okay. 11 members of the Zoning Commission, my name is Eartha 12 Isaac, and I'm President of the Eckington Civic 13 Association. I'm also a resident who is within 200 feet 14 15 of the proposed development. I'd like to just take a minute to briefly 16 17 let you know that in 2004 our civic association held 18 what we call a visioning session, and we took a look 19 at some of the things that we wanted to happen in our 2.0 neighborhood in the Eckington community. As you know, North Capitol Street is one 21 22 of our major corridors. It's a commercial corridor, 23 but we have nothing. We do not have a place that we 24 can walk to get a load a bread, a quart of milk, a 25 decent meal.

And so we are a community that sadly has absolutely no amenities. As we conducted our visioning session in 2004, a lot of issues came to the fore, things that people in the community wanted: a sit-down restaurant, a coffee shop, a small grocery store, dry cleaners, book store, additional housing, because we also feel that we are in a part of Ward 5 and a part of the city that is often forgotten.

And part of that is because of the fact that we don't have the density that we need. So when this particular development presented at an ANC meeting over a year ago, we were, number one, very excited that there was interest in development within the Eckington neighborhood, and we became engaged with them,, discussing the issues that were of concern to us.

You have before you in your package a May 16th, 2006 letter that is a letter of support from the Eckington Civic Association, and I'm joined by J.T. Engelhardt, who is the co-chair of our Economic Development Committee.

As a civic association, we support this particular development because it brings to our community many of the amenities that we've been looking for. We have found the developers to be open.

They initially wanted about 1,000 units, and we say no. The ANC said, "No, that's too many."

And they have at every single turn when we've raised issues even about design, and we are lay people. We are not, you know, architects or anything, but initially there was a roof design that I likened to something from Star Trek because it looked like a spaceship about to take off, and we sort of jokingly talked about that at one of the meetings in which they -- one of our civil association meetings that they attended.

And even though we aren't professionals and don't have any knowledge of design, they took us seriously. They went back. They redesigned.

I think that one of the things personally I like most about working with this particular group is that they have been very respectful of what the neighborhood has wanted. I live on R Street, N.E. I'm one of the neighbors that's impacted very much by FedEx. I'm one of the neighbors who is impacted by the fact that originally, before FedEx was built, traffic was supposed to flow out of Harry Thomas Way, use Fourth Street, and then go on to Florida and North Capitol, and that apparently never happened, hasn't happened, and that's caused a problem.

But in looking at what this particular development will bring to the neighborhood, in addition to the amenities, one of our concerns is that, you know, we are very much in favor of adding more affordable housing. You know, certainly as a development that was designed to be a development that is market rate, the fact that there will be affordable units here, which will provide members of our community and others within Washington the opportunity to live in a first rate development at a lower rate is something that we certainly would support.

I know my time is up, but I'd like to just add one other point. On the issue of having more than the needed parking spaces, we have an over abundance of Maryland and Virginia tags in our community, and although our commercial neighbors are neighbors that we want to remain in the community, we know that they don't have enough parking.

So we have actually started encouraging some of those commercial neighbors to talk with Fairfield about utilization of some of those spaces down the line, and we have also talked with Fairfield about the fact that that would probably be a good partnership.

I know my time is up, and so thank you for

allowing me this opportunity to make comments.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you.

Mr. Engelhardt.

MR. ENGELHARDT: Yes. Hello. I am also with the Eckington Civic Association. I chair the Economic Development Committee, and I've been working closely with Paul and the developers throughout this process, helping them figure out how to navigate through the community and the ANC and also working with them to address Eckington as the nearest impacted community's issues with their plan and have found them to be very open, and they've revised their plans as we've asked.

But I want to address, first of all, the current zoning of the site is industrial, and that's a brand new Metro station right there. Dense residential near the Metro is good urban planning, and it's something that as a resident of Eckington and somebody that's a couple of blocks from the site, I look forward to. I look forward to more feet on the ground. I look forward to people being able to live in D.C. without cars and, you know, hopefully the economics of the situation will be that if parking is tough, then they have the option of living in D.C. without cars.

1	So I think it's good urban planning. They
2	have given us an amenities package that includes
3	dedicated office space, which we're very excited
4	about, and the ANC is also very excited about. So
5	we're pleased with that, and in general, it has been
6	a very open process, and I and Eckington Civil
7	Association, through a vote, wholeheartedly support
8	this rezoning request.
9	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you both.
10	Questions? Any questions?
11	(No response.)
12	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Thank you both
13	for your testimony.
14	Anyone else who would like to testify in
15	support?
16	(No response.)
17	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Anyone who
18	would like to testify in opposition?
19	Please go ahead whenever you're ready.
20	MS. MARTIN: My name is Quinta Martin, and
21	I am very new to the neighborhood. I just purchased
22	property that is the back door of where this is being
23	developed.
24	I think that this property or this
25	proposal is changing the character of the

neighborhood. None of the buildings that they have shown, the XM Building, the People's Building, the FedEx Building, are as tall or overwhelming with regards to the other character of the neighborhood, which is all residential properties.

I live in the new, contemporary town -what did he call it? -- townhome, rowhouse. I'm one
of the residents of that property. So I am very
concerned about the fact that we're putting a big
highrise, extra tall building in an area where you
have lower level buildings, and it changes the
character and nature of the area.

Currently we're talking about putting 675 units on a space that's the size of a high school football field, which means that we will have lots and lots of traffic. I can tell you it takes more than two minutes to get out of Eckington Street onto Florida Avenue. It takes more than two minutes to get off of Eckington Street onto R Street.

If you look at the traffic patterns of one-way streets and dead end streets and how they run together, there will be considerable amount of traffic and congestion, more than what we already have.

We have few parking spaces in the block which surrounds this area. There are less than 75

parking spaces around this whole four-point area. Those parking spaces are currently being used by employees, XM Satellite, the office building complex on Q Street and Eckington Street, the employees who work at the D.C. government building at the corner of Harry Thomas Way and R Street. So there is no over abundance of parking available for you to add 675 units for people to park, as well as for traffic. When we are talking about looking at the future of a neighborhood, I think we should look at not only the fact that we're trying to bring better housing or more affordable housing, which I am a little concerned about the affordability. just cost \$590,000. So how are you talking about affordability if you're talking about bringing in a \$590,000 three-bedroom unit in a condominium and you're talking about 675 units. So I have a little concern about the level of affordability that we're talking about when you're talking about bringing things in. I think in terms of the project, having a problem is a good idea. I think this project needs to be relooked at. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Do you live on R

Street?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

1	MS. MARTIN: I live right behind where
2	they're talking about putting it. So I will have a
3	big, tall building that I will be looking at out of my
4	back bedroom window.
5	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Could you just give
6	us your address?
7	MS. MARTIN: 213 R Street, N.E.
8	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Thank you.
9	COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Well, excuse me.
10	Two, thirteen, so that's R and Second?
11	MS. MARTIN: Between Second and Third
12	Street. So when I'm walking my dog, I walk my dog
13	around the parcel of land that they're talking about.
14	COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Oh, I see. Okay,
15	okay.
16	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Sir, why don't you go
17	ahead?
18	MR. CLARK: Good evening. My name is
19	Michael Clark. I'm the President of the Edgewood
20	Civic Association, which encompasses all of Eckington
21	and quite a bit of the area.
22	Our concern with the project as a civic
23	association is on May 18th, the officers and members
24	of the Edgewood Civic Association met with the
25	representatives of the Fairfield Group developers of

the planned Commerce Center. That meeting only took place because the ANC-5C would not vote for the project unless they meet with our civic association because our members will be greatly affected by this development.

As I went about passing out flyers for our meeting and the flyers that the Fairfield Group provided for us to inform the neighbors, which live on her side of R Street and Second and Third Street, everyone I talked to, none of them had a clue what was happening in their neighborhood.

So when the talk earlier was about the community, how Fairfield and Eckington, the community supports the project and the community -- they have been very receptive to the community, our civil association have seen -- only because of the ANC stepping in we would not have even known about the project, and people will be greatly affected.

I travel that route every day to go to work. My child goes to McKinley Tech High School, and it's a bear getting in and out of there all day long. We proposed eight points and came up with a meeting at the Fairfield Group, and we thought it was a very good meeting. We had a lot of question about it. The members had a lot of questions. They came and they

1 presented it to us. We came up with eight questions, 2 and we gave it to the ANC-5C Commissioners at their 3 last meeting. 4 One of the Commissioners, Mr. Burr, I 5 believe, has communicated with Fairfield, I believe, about these questions, and some of the same questions 6 7 that you asked our concern was, about there was no impact study about the socioeconomic impact this 8 9 development will have on our community. We're talking about possibly changing an 10 11 SMD because of the number of people that are coming 12 into this community. We talked about the traffic analysis, how 13 14 it was seriously flawed about how traffic is going to 15 flow through that area. If it's a problem now, we think it's going to spill over into the Second and 16 Third Street for the people who are coming into work. 17 18 Everybody is not going to use the Metro, 19 and that is evident. 20 Another issue that we brought up and 21 questioned about, the number of affordable units. 22 They told us in our meeting that there would be 60 or 23 65 units out of the 625 to 675 units, or about ten 24 percent, and they couldn't really pinpoint down how

many square feet that was.

We also had a concern about the height of the building. It should be lower to coincide with other buildings to the southwest of the community.

We also had a concern about the draft with the First Source employment agreement.

Another question was what will happen because the spillover from McKinley Tech High School, the students who get out of school. My son goes to McKinley Tech High School. There are three schools in the area. So when the children are getting out of McKinley Tech High School, the Back Gate on R Street, the straight shot is straight down Eckington Place to New York to the Metro, and when they are now coming down; let's say the development is built. They come down through the Gate, down Eckington Place. They're going to make that left turn and go through the community now. Now they're going through a community to get to the pass to go to the Metro.

Is there going to be any repercussions behind that?

Our concern was with security. Will they have their own security there, or will our stressed police force be used to also cover that area? I know that's part of their job, but we see that they also should have their own security force there, and that's

2.0

another question we brought up.

So those are the questions that we brought up as a civic association to Fairfield Developers, and our questions were not answered by Fairfield Development.

I'm not totally against the project, but
I think when we talk about community here, what
community are we talking about? The whole community
was not involved in this process when it began because
our community was not involved until as of late.
We're coming in on the tail end of this.

So the meeting space that was provided, has been provided there, I don't think our community, our association is involved in that. The amenities package that was set up, the amenity package, when they came to our meeting, they put together an amenity package for our development which was different from the first amenity package that I saw and was giving \$15,000 to the Edgewood Civic Association to be used for community improvement projects.

Well, we have never talked to Fairfield about any type of amenity project or any kind of money, and then the latest amenity package has taken the \$15,000 they were going to give to us and put it into the ANC-5C and make it 30,000 for community

1	projects.
2	The only thing, we've never asked for
3	anything. The only thing we asked for is that it
4	would have affordable housing and be community
5	friendly.
6	These neighbors are coming in. We want a
7	good project for the community so that everybody can
8	benefit and not just a few.
9	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you, Mr. Clark.
10	Did you have an official submission from
11	your civic association for us? Because we don't have
12	anything in the record.
13	MR. CLARK: No. I have the letter that we
14	gave the ANC Commission. This was my testimony for
15	tonight.
16	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Well, if you
17	have anything in writing that you'd like to submit for
18	the record
19	MR. CLARK: Sure.
20	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: we'd be happy to
21	receive it.
22	Any questions for these folks? Any
23	questions? Mr. Hood.
24	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: What are your
25	boundaries? What are you civic association's

2 Edgewood Civic Association's MR. CLARK: 3 boundaries run from Florida Avenue all the way up to 4 North Capitol, up North Capitol to Michigan, Michigan 5 all the way across past Catholic U. to the tracks basically, to the railroad tracks, and straight down 6 7 the railroad tracks all the way behind -- all the way 8 down to the Metro Station. So we're encompassing --VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: And that's under 9 10 the D.C. Federation of Civic Associations? 11 MR. CLARK: Yes, we are an official 12 member, the only civic association in the area that's an official member of the D.C. Federation of Civic 13 14 Associations, and we are a 501(c)(3) tax exempt 15 organization, the only civic association, again, that has that standing in that area. 16 17 And, again, we were not talked to about 18 this project until the tail end. 19 VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay, and I forgot 20 your name -- I'm sorry -- the young lady at the table. 21 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Ms. Isaac. 22 VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Ms. Isaac. 23 you. 24 The Chair always helps me remember. 25 Ms. Isaac, I --

1

boundaries?

1	MS. MARTIN: I'm Quinta Martin.
2	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Oh, I'm sorry. That
3	was the other woman.
4	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Well, I can't give
5	her see how she helps me remember?
6	(Laughter.)
7	MS. MARTIN: My name is Martin.
8	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Sorry about that.
9	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: We were trying to
10	figure out. You're at Second and R Street, right?
11	MS. MARTIN: Correct.
12	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: And this project
13	is going to back right up to your home.
14	MS. MARTIN: Correct.
15	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Are you aware of
16	what this is already zoned, what the uses that can go
17	in?
18	MS. MARTIN: Actually I'm not. There is
19	a I should say to the right, to the exact back of
20	my house, there's a little flat building that's the
21	State Farm Insurance, auto insurance, building.
22	That's to the actual to the alley.
23	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I understand.
24	MS. MARTIN: But if you go the actual
25	parcel that you're talking about is right next to

1	that. So with a ten story, nine story building right
2	next to that little flat State Farm Building and the
3	wholesale the Flower Warehouse, I mean, it's going
4	to dwarf everything. I mean, it dwarfs XM Satellite,
5	Federal Express. Pepco is building a building on the
6	other side of Harry Thomas Way right across from it.
7	It is a short flat building about four stories tall.
8	So this is going to be a big albatross
9	that sits out in the middle of all these short
10	buildings.
11	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: But you're not
12	necessarily against the project. You just have a
13	problem with the height and some other issues.
14	MS. MARTIN: I have a problem with the
15	height and the number of units because I think 675
16	units on a four acre plot
17	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Because you know
18	as it stands now it's zoned M. You might want to find
19	out what actually can go in a M zone, believe me.
20	MS. MARTIN: I have an idea.
21	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So trust me.
22	MS. MARTIN: I have an idea it's probably
23	much more than 675.
24	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: There's some
25	things that may not be desirable. So I would just

1	encourage you to work along and find out exactly what
2	can go in M zoning and try to maybe I don't know
3	how much farther you can change the project, but find
4	out what can go in the M zone and trust me. In Ward
5	5, we need to know that.
6	Thank you, Madam Chair.
7	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you, Mr. Hood.
8	Anyone else?
9	MS. MARTIN: Thank you very much.
10	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Mr. Jeffries.
11	Hold on.
12	COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Actually I'm
13	curious. I don't know much about the world of civic
14	associations as much as the Vice Chair does, but the
15	Eckington Civic Association and I know that they're
16	not up there is there any overlap in terms of the
17	boundaries?
18	MR. CLARK: They're within our boundaries.
19	COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Oh, so they're a
20	sub. Okay.
21	MR. CLARK: They're within our boundaries.
22	We're a member of the D.C. Federation of Civic
23	Associations. Our boundaries are registered with the
24	D.C. Federal of Civic Associations. They are within
25	our boundaries. We have a map that states that the

1	D.C. Federation of Civic Association states that, and
2	D.C. Federation of Civic Association's legal counsel
3	said there's nothing we can do, that anybody can come
4	in and call itself a civic association, but if they
5	want to become a member of the D.C. Federation of
6	Civic Associations, we would have to give up our
7	territory in order for them to become a member of the
8	D.C. Federation of Civic Associations.
9	COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Okay. Well,
10	perhaps it might be helpful at least to me in the
11	record just to understand the boundaries of both these
12	civic associations. I mean, if the record is going to
13	be open just to be clear about the boundaries and so
14	forth because, you know, we have one civic association
15	that's supportive, another one that isn't. I'm just
16	trying to get a sense of, you know, what's being
17	represented here.
18	So thank you.
19	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Mr. Tummonds, did you
20	have any questions?
21	MR. TUMMONDS: No questions.
22	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Thank you both
23	for your testimony.
24	Anyone else who would like to testify in
25	opposition?

1 (No response.) 2 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Mr. Tummonds, 3 it's all yours. 4 MR. TUMMONDS: Thank you. As noted in the materials filed in the 5 record of this case and the testimony that 6 7 presented this evening, we believe that the proposed project will create an exciting mixed use project that 8 will enhance and enliven the immediate area with the 9 10 creation of an appropriate amount of new residential 11 units, including a significant affordable housing 12 component, the extension of Q Street through the 13 property, the creation of neighborhood serving retail, 14 and importantly the construction of pedestrian and 15 bicycle connection to the Metropolitan Branch Trail. These are all important aspects of this 16 17 project that make this project, we believe, truly a 18 benefit to the neighborhood. We believe that the heightened massing of 19 20 the project will serve as an appropriate buffer between the residential Eckington neighborhood to the 21 22 north and west of the project and the commercial and industrial uses located to the south and east of the 23 24 project. 25 We believe that this project is consistent

with transit oriented development planning goals and the District's planning and economic development goals for this part of the city.

We believe the proposed project and the community amenities package we are proposing is significant. The design details of the building, the site planning, and the proposed landscaping all create a project of exemplary architecture and site planning.

For all of these reasons, we believe that the proposed project satisfies the zoning regulations requirements for approval of planned unit development and zoning map amendment application, and therefore, we request that you approve this application.

We recognize that there is additional information that you've requested this evening. We will submit that for the record and also provide, as Mr. Cochran said, we believe an appropriate amount of time for the Office of Planning and DDOT to respond to the traffic reports that we will provide from Grove Slade Associates.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: So help me with timing a little bit here. How much time do you all need to get the stuff in so that we can then give some time for responses?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	MR. TUMMONDS: We believe that based on
2	I just spoke with Mr. Schiesel about this in order
3	to prepare some of the information that DDOT is
4	requesting, we have to get some background information
5	from them. They've been very good in our dialogue in
6	the past week about that.
7	We would hope that we would be able to
8	submit this information by the middle of August, say,
9	so 30 days. I would love to shoot for coming back
10	before you for a decision at the September 11th Zoning
11	Commission public meeting.
12	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.
13	MR. TUMMONDS: We would work towards that
14	and then give the Office of Planning, DDOT the week or
15	two that it needs to respond in order to get that
16	information to you.
17	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.
18	MR. TUMMONDS: So in working with Ms.
19	Schellin, if we backed away from that.
20	MR. SCHIESEL: Additional filings due
21	April 14th.
22	MR. TUMMONDS: August?
23	MR. SCHIESEL: I'm sorry. August, and
24	then two weeks for DDOT would make it August 28th, and
25	then we could still tentatively put it on the

1	September agenda.
2	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Does that work for
3	you on the 14th?
4	MR. TUMMONDS: We will do anything and
5	everything we can to get it here on the 14th. Yes,
6	absolutely.
7	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay, and Office of
8	Planning, you guys can weigh in then in the two-week
9	time frame?
10	MR. COCHRAN: Yes, ma'am.
11	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. That's great.
12	Do I need to repeat the dates or do you
13	MR. TUMMONDS: The dates are fine.
14	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay, and so the
15	record will be open then until the 28th.
16	MR. SCHIESEL: Fourteenth.
17	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: It will just be
18	generally open. You guys have to deliver on the 14th
19	so that they can deliver on the 28th.
20	MR. TUMMONDS: Exactly.
21	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: But we'll leave the
22	record open for any additional submissions until the
23	28th, but you guys have a
24	MR. TUMMONDS: We're driving this here.
25	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Yes, you're driving

	114
1	it.
2	Okay. I'd just like to thank everyone for
3	coming out this evening, and if you're interested in
4	making sure whether this actually gets on our agenda
5	for September, because if it's a really long one, you
6	know, we make no promises, and I think it will be a
7	long one. You can contact Ms. Schellin and she'll let
8	you know if it's on the agenda for a particular
9	meeting.
10	So thanks again, and we're adjourned.
11	(Whereupon, at 8:59 p.m., the public
12	hearing in the above-entitled matter was adjourned.)
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	

23

24